AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—VOL. II.—(XXII).—APRIL, 1900.—NO. 4.

THE NATURAL LAW IN MARRIAGE.

THE motive of the present article is to set forth the provisions of the natural law in the matter of marriage. Perhaps fully two-thirds of the members of our vast population have not been submitted, whether validly or invalidly, to the waters of Baptism. They are, therefore, not endued with the virtue of Christian faith. At the very best, unaided reason alone can be their guide to the knowledge of the natural law. One time, when the law began to be dimmed in the minds of the chosen people on account of evil habits, that law was written for them on tables of stone. In the new dispensation there is no graving upon tables of stone. Still, Christ tells us that He did not come to destroy the law, but to perfect it. He has left a divinely appointed guardian of the full truth of the law; and in His Church alone have the precepts of the law been preserved in their entirety and purity. From the sixteenth century, when this divinely appointed guardianship of the moral truth was repudiated as existing in the Church militant, there has grown up again that same old darkness, on account of which the law was once written for the Israelites on tables of stone. Without the divine guardianship and without the tables of stone, those who are walking in the darkness are falling back more and more upon arbitrary civil statute as their sole basis of morality.

From all this there arises a condition of things which is well worthy of our attention. With our higher teacher in the supernatural order, we get our moral truths easily in the declarations of faith. Hence we are apt to give less attention to the reasoned basis of the decalogue, since we have them from revelation in the divine positive law. On the other hand, those who have

not the faith are thrown back more and more upon the arbitrary human civil law. Thus we get farther and farther apart, forgetting the common fundamental ground of the natural law. We get our morality from a divine declaration. Those upon the outside tend to accept their morality from the declaration of a majority of human voices in council. If the majority says "white," the morality of a deed is white; if to-morrow the majority says "black," the deed becomes as black as the majority pleases.

There has been a very peculiar instance of majority rule in the case of Mr. Roberts, polygamist, before the House of Representatives of the United States. The majority report of the committee was for excluding him by a plurality vote, precedent being cited for such power to exclude. The minority report affirmed that he had the qualifications required for admission, and could not, therefore, be justly excluded; that he should be admitted, and thereupon be expelled by a two-thirds vote, such vote being sufficient for expulsion, with or without reason assigned. There is a haziness about the whole proceeding. The final decision was objectively right—Mr. Roberts was excluded. But the real basis of the right was not presented. What might be the decision of Congress on a case of the divorce and successive polygamy which is pronounced perfectly moral by State legislatures? It is evidently opportune for us to make a review of those principles of the natural law—unchangeable principles, which must govern the matrimonial society.

A *society* is universally recognized to be established there wheresoever is found *a stable moral union of two or more persons joined together by the mutually manifested common intent of pursuing a common end in community of effort.* The name society is given to the stable union only. We are not accustomed to apply it to a pic-nic party, for instance, or an indignation meeting, but solely to such unions as have an element of permanence and stability. Mere number of persons will not make a society. The mere gathering of many in the same place will make a crowd, but not a society. The bond must be a moral bond, uniting men in that in which they

are distinctively human, in intellect and free will. The bond is the common purpose known and pursued by all. There must also be community of effort in the use of common means to the attainment of the common end.

Man's sociability is the universal fact of human history. It is strictly the result of a natural law; for the fact is universal and constant under all possible variations of climate, and speech, and mode of living. The social condition is human nature's first dictate as to the means it requires to supply both its absolute and suitable needs. This primary dictate of human nature is one which man, with all history open before him, has never thought to correct, to modify, or to annul.

The possible kinds of human association are as multifarious as the ends for which men can work together in common. Whenever the force impelling men to the formation of a given society is human nature itself, considered in its essentials, and thus urging mankind *in general* to the formation of that given society as to the means necessary for the existence of human nature, for its extension, and for the possibility of the fuller complement of the welfare of human kind, such society is very justly styled a natural and necessary society. There are two such societies—domestic society and civil society. Man is impelled by the essential conditions of human nature, considered in the aggregate of humanity, to the establishment of the family and of the State.

We need not here go into the philosophy of this matter. But that man is impelled into these two kinds of society by the very force of nature is evidenced by the universal and constant fact of history. The existence of the family and of civil association go back to the beginning. No changes, not all of the changes and upheavals of all the centuries, have been able to dissipate the innate momentum by which human nature is borne to the establishment of these two societies. No other forms of society have unfailingly and universally survived all the changes in the records of the race. But out of the scattering of families

and the destruction of States, the new family and the new State have always risen immediately, as by inevitable law. This fact in the history of humanity, universal and constant where all else has changed, human nature alone remaining intact, must necessarily be ascribed to the inherent force of human nature impelling.

The first natural and necessary society, then, which we find amongst men is marriage. Marriage is a stable union between fit persons, a man and a woman, for the purpose of generating and rearing children. This stable union is brought about by a contract, by which a man and a woman bind themselves, one to the other, to the end proposed. It cannot be established otherwise than by contract, since it implies the yielding up of a certain personal independence and autonomy, which is the native right of each individual member of the human race. In the Christian dispensation, the contract has been raised to the dignity of a Sacrament. We are limiting ourselves here, however, to the question of marriage considered simply in the natural order, and not in its higher sacramental character.

To be a real contract, marriage must fulfil all the conditions of a contract. There must be a real, free, mutual, internal consent, on the part of both the man and the woman, and this internal consent must be manifested by some external sign, by words or their equivalent, so that the internal consent of each of the persons contracting may be fully made known to the other. The consent must be a present consent, and be understood to be such. In the formula commonly used the consent is expressed by the words, "I will." These words, as they stand, might indicate consent to take effect at some future time. But they are understood and are intended to signify a consent given and accepted at the time of its expression, and not a consent which is to take effect at some future time, whether fixed or indefinite. The consent must also be given with all the deliberation, knowledge, and liberty demanded for the validity of a contract.

The matrimonial union is a natural society. It will not be deemed necessary for us at this date, with history back of us,

to undertake to establish that marriage is a natural thing. It is of no use for men to decry it and to say that it is a failure. As a natural thing, it cannot, in itself, be a failure. If there are, often enough, uncomfortable circumstances connected with the concrete marriage, these are due, not to marriage in itself considered, but to the individual who will not govern his passions according to the laws of nature: the inconveniences are due to the wilful departure from the norm of conduct which should be followed by all those who enter into the married state. The naturalness of this state does, by its very continuance, assert and re-assert itself, over and over again, in each succeeding generation, despite all the recorded experiences of the past.

Marriage, then, is a natural thing. It is the natural means provided by nature for an end. This natural end of marriage is the generation of offspring, the propagation of the human race. Still, the end of the contract is not merely the generation of offspring. This end includes, also, the putting of that offspring in a condition fitting to its nature. Hence, in the contract there is necessarily implied the assumption of all the duties consequent upon the fact of offspring.

The parent, as responsible for the existence of the child, is also responsible for all that is demanded by the fitting existence of the child. The child, from the first moment of its existence, has a solemn claim against both father and mother. It has a right against them for the means necessary to continue the existence for which they are responsible. It has a right against them also for that early discipline, training, guidance, advice, upon which the fitness for a becoming career in most part depends. The parents have, therefore, the solemn obligation of bestowing upon the child the care demanded to bring forward its existence to a certain physical, mental, and moral development. The precise degree to which this development has to be pursued, we have not to consider here. Neither is it necessary to enter into the accidental case of the orphan, which forms matter for discussion among the civil problems. All that we have to affirm here is that the rearing, the education of the child is necessarily tied up with the generation of the child, so as to form with it one complete end intended in

marriage. Hence the obligation of taking the necessary means to this complete end, an obligation inseparable from the event of offspring, is assumed in the marriage contract.

The complete primary end of matrimony must, therefore, always be laid down to be "offspring to be brought to the condition demanded by the nature of the offspring." The rearing and the education must be considered to enter as an inseparable part into the undivided end. It does not matter that this duty of development may, sometimes, by the death or inability of the parents, be thrown back upon others, in accordance with the general laws of humanity or the special obligations of the civil community. These accidental possibilities do not enter into the present question.

It will appear, now, why marriage was defined at the outset as a *stable* union. The character of the end to be attained demands that fixedness and unity, to the exclusion of promiscuity, have to enter as essentials into the matter of the contract. Stability is required for the secure as well as for the suitable attainment of the end. It is demanded especially for the fitting education of the new accession to the human race. The simple fact of a father and a mother is not enough. The child requires determinate and continuous parents, both father and mother. Whatsoever may be the accidental possibilities for the due rearing of the child under other conditions in some individual cases, these do not establish a universal law; furthermore, no such possibility of the fulfilment of the law, without stability, can ever be foreseen.

The wonderful partition made in the natural gifts that are bestowed respectively upon the man and the woman indicates that a stability of union is intended as one of the natural and necessary conditions of the contract. We find in the two a diversity of bodily and mental gifts and of emotional susceptibilities, and a very marked distribution of tastes. There is a division of the qualities which must go to make up the full equipment for the complete end of marriage. Where one seems to be less supplied, the other abounds. Force upon the one side is tempered by delicacy on the other; ruggedness is smoothed by refinement. At the same

time, gentleness is strengthened and made secure by reliance upon force. And yet this dependence, on the one hand, is elevated by reverence on the other. In fact, from every point of view, we behold complementary phases of character, distinct but harmonizing gifts—the whole leading up to a balance, an equilibrium which is contemplated in the order of nature to necessitate, to constitute, and to establish, to encourage, to foster, and to cement a *union*, and to strengthen the unity and give it the stability required for the better attainment of the natural end. This is something that has always been clear and evident to mankind. It is a truth which, without analysis or argument, has entered into the instinctive knowledge of humanity. It is arrived at by a primary judgment, which is made without philosophizing; and so deeply rooted is the conviction of the truth of this instinctive judgment, that no phenomenon in human society is more repellant than a masculine woman, and none more ridiculous than an effeminate man.

Though marriage is in the order of nature, yet it is not an obligation upon each and every member of the human race. The inclinations which point to the laws of nature are of two kinds. Some indicate laws which have for immediate end the perfection of the individual; others, that of the race. Those laws which have for their end the necessary perfection of the individual are of obligation for each individual; such is the obligation of taking food to preserve life. Laws which have for their immediate end that which is intended for the race, create an obligation for the race, but not necessarily nor consequently for each individual in the race—provided that the end can be attained without compliance by each individual. Such, indeed, is the assuming of the marriage bond, which has for its end the fit propagation of the race.

Nature, then, gives the impulse to the stable union for the fit propagation of the race. At the same time, it is not nature's law for every individual to enter the married state. No one may employ nature's means except to nature's end. But nature does not bind each individual to a prosecution of the end. This is evident from the fact that the end can be fully attained without putting the precept upon each individual.

If it be argued that nature's tendency shows that it is nature's law that men shall increase and multiply; we answer, again, that the law is for the race, and not for each individual, absolutely. If the law is to be taken as absolute for each individual, then must it be taken to be binding absolutely upon each individual so soon as he is capable of carrying out the law. There is no one who would think of entertaining the absurdity of the latter proposition; but the other, on the same grounds, is equally absurd. There will never be any danger for the race. Should there ever be, it will be time enough, then, to consider what may be the special precautions to be taken against such an event. But we are, just now, so far from any danger, that the literature of the world is taken up with the question of marrying and giving in marriage. The book that does not contain the wooing and the winning and the orange blossoms has a sorry fate in the public library.

Moreover, nature's end in giving the impulse is not simply to increase and multiply. Man's progressive nature shows that he individually, and the race collectively, are intended for something more than increase and multiplication. Religious and moral culture, learning and the arts, belong to the new member immediately upon the fact of multiplication; and they belong by a law just as stringent as the one that calls for multiplication. They belong by the very same law taken in its entirety. Now, no one will deny that celibacy is far more conducive than is marriage to the providing of the higher intellectual, moral, spiritual goods for the race. The few who follow the inspiration of giving themselves to the life of the celibate for the purpose of providing these higher goods for the race are doing far more for humanity than those who simply people the earth. Those who pose as the enemies of celibacy are not often found to be very . . . St. Paul told the whole story centuries ago.

On whom, then, is marriage obligatory? This question would have to be discussed according to the circumstances of a given time, when the race as a whole was not fulfilling its obligation. But the race is safe to-day. It has always been safe, and without doubt it always will be. So that, as we

have said, if one or another individual chooses to abstain from marriage in order to give himself to a higher life, there is no law to the contrary. Marriage is not necessary to him personally, and his marriage is not necessary to the race. On the contrary, it is certain that he can give himself better to the higher life as a celibate than he could as burdened with the cares of a family. And it is certain, too, considering the few who will embrace the life of celibacy, that he can, as a celibate, provide for society advantages which it could not otherwise have. This does not at all imply that one can abstain from a definite marriage in order to lead a life of promiscuity, a little lower than the animal; for this would be a life of crime, a use of nature's means against nature's end, to the debasement of himself and others and to the promotion of general depravity.

In this comparison between marriage and celibacy, the comparison is between the states and not between the persons found in them; for true marriage is a holy thing, in which personal sanctity can be fully attained. But the state of celibacy is a higher state, which affords the opportunity that is not so easily found in marriage, for closer union with God and the elevation of the soul to spiritual things.

Marriage, then, is not necessary for all. The end, which is the propagation and fit education of the race, can be attained without the marriage of all the members. Hence, the obligation does not fall upon any determinate individual taken singly. The most that can be asked or conceded is, that there be increase and proper rearing.

As marriage is a natural thing, nature's means to an end, it must be ruled by the laws which are necessary that the means may be really directed to the end. Hence, any arbitrary act upon the part of man which would render the use of the means unsuited to the becoming attainment of the end, would be against the law of nature. It is against the natural law to use nature's specific means in such a way as to hinder nature's specific end, or to use the means in such partial way as to render impossible the employment of the complete means demanded for the due establishment of the end.

Moreover, marriage is a contract. Considered even in the

natural state, and not as a Sacrament, it must have all the conditions of a contract. It must, therefore, necessarily be conditioned by the inherent nature of its subject-matter. Hence, as a contract, it can never be lawful in opposition to the natural laws that govern its subject-matter.

From these principles it follows that the matrimonial contract must have two natural and necessary properties: unity and indissolubility as opposed to polygamy and divorce.

To the unity of marriage is opposed *polygamy*, which is simultaneous marriage with more than one person. The marriage of one woman to two or more men is called polyandry. The marriage of one man to two or more women is called polygyny. Both polyandry and polygyny are against the natural law.

Polyandry is clearly against the primary end of matrimony. It is also necessarily an obstacle to the secondary end, or the establishment of that domestic society which is the necessary means to the complete end. Polyandry is a direct impediment to the existence of offspring. The usual result of it is infertility. Even when this does not occur, the child is left fatherless. Every child is born without a definite father. Its natural consequence is, thus, a race of orphans for whom no man is responsible. The lot of the fatherless family is a hard one both for mother and child, even when it happens in the unavoidable uncertainties of life. Who can presume to say that such a universal disposition is in keeping with the laws of nature?

But even though the two preceding difficulties should be passed over (as they cannot), the domestic society, the necessary means, cannot be established under the conditions of polyandry. It is morally impossible for the woman to live as the wife of half a dozen husbands. It is impossible that there should be that natural association which nature has provided for in the distribution of her gifts, and which is necessary to the end. Thus the unnaturalness of the thing is not only in hindering nature's end, but also in hindering nature's means to nature's end. What kind of a household can it be—that of the woman with many husbands? Only a den of disorder; a household never in peace; the scene of endless quarrels and jealousies, absolutely

inimical to the establishment of a society, and especially of a society which nature demands for the fit rearing of the human being. Imagine a woman with seven husbands! Put five hundred such households in a city, and five hundred police courts will not be able to regulate them.

In some respects polygyny is not so roundly and comprehensively opposed to the natural law as is polyandry. It does not, in itself, present the same impediment to the fact of offspring, but it defeats everything else. It is incompatible with that society which some call the secondary end of marriage, but which we have called nature's means to the undivided end, a society which is necessary for the due formation of the child, a formation, moreover, for which the child has an absolute right against the parents. It renders the true conjugal society impossible. There can never be established the necessary equality between the several wives and the husband, nor the equality of treatment that is due in the rearing of the child. A man cannot fulfil his duty to two wives and to two sets of children, much less to half a dozen separate families. Nature has ordained that there be love between two, and the man who gives his love to one woman must abide by it. Nature has ordained a single intense love, to the end of the formation of a stable society, which society it ordains, further, to that complete end we are so repeatedly holding up to view. Plurality of wives divides the love, destroys the love. This divided love of the man, with its fickle preferences and neglects and consequent jealousies, can produce only a household of furies or a household of slaves. It can result only in a condition of things which is directly inimical to the schooling to which the human nature of the child has a right from those who are responsible for its existence.

We are not obliged, here, to make any account of a stray incidental case. Such a case cannot be taken as a rule. We must consider human nature as we know it around us and in history. Neither do we have to enter into the question of the plurality of wives under the old law, with the special safeguards instituted by divine authority to obviate the evils destructive of the end of marriage. Apart from such divine ordinations, which

can be known only by an undoubted supernatural revelation, human nature is such as we have described it, and as such we have to take it.

Matrimony is a society. It is a stable union. The union is established by contract. What is the duration assigned or assignable to the contract? Is this left to the free choice of the parties contracting? Must they contract for a given term of years? Or may they contract for an indefinite term to be closed by agreement, on displeasure? Or is there anything in the contract itself by which the term is fixed?

A contract must be entered into always according to the conditions of the matter that comes under the contract. The definition of the term of a contract must necessarily be subject to the will of one who may have absolute control over the matter of the contract. If the parties contracting have such absolute control, the contract may be made for a period according to their will, or it may be made for an indefinite time to be fixed later by mutual consent. As matrimony is a contract in the order of nature, there is no doubt that it can be dissolved by the Author of nature, as also by one who might have power to the same effect from the Author of nature. But can the bond be broken by any purely human authority acting on its own lights and responsibilities? Or have the parties contracting the power to put an arbitrary limit to the contract, whether at the moment of the contract or at some future time? Have they, by nature, such power over the matter of the contract as to be invested with the prerogative of dissolving the bond at will? The bond cannot be broken, whether by the parties themselves or by any mere human authority.

We must make a distinction between imperfect and perfect dissolution, imperfect and perfect divorce. We can admit the imperfect divorce in which a mere separation is allowed in some circumstances,—all precaution, however, being taken to provide for the better welfare of the children. But the question here does not concern the mere separation. The question is about breaking of the bond, about the perfect divorce,—such that each party may validly contract marriage again whilst the other party is living. There is no difficulty in recognizing the possible

legality of a mere separation under certain circumstances. But the matter of the contract is such in the order of nature that the dissolution of the contract, to the effect that either party may marry again during the lifetime of the other, is something that is altogether outside the jurisdiction of the parties contracting, as it is outside the jurisdiction of any purely human power whatsoever. Any attempted dissolution by mutual agreement, or upon the presumptions of human legislation, is null and void, and is a crime against a primary precept of the natural law, because directly opposed to the end for which the conjugal society has been by nature ordained.

Divorce (we refer, now, only to the presumed severance of the bond) is destructive of conjugal society, of the rights of the child, and of public order and decency. Under the recognition of divorce and divorce legislation, marriage becomes only a temporary friendship, a temporary infatuation, a whim to follow to-day and to give up to-morrow, a thing to foster hasty loves and perpetual hates, a pretext for crimes that may enable the dissatisfied to separate. Married life, instead of being a state of mutual love and faith, of harmony, devotedness, and forbearance, is made a special occasion for suspicion and distrust; and the rights of the child are thwarted from the outset in the repudiation of parental obligation.

Divorce puts an end to the common decencies of society. It becomes an invitation for married men and women to carry on their loves with the married and the unmarried. It is not necessary to recapitulate the crimes and disorders actually arising from this. The growing calendar of crimes bred from this one cause is an omen of decay, the inevitable vengeance which the violated laws of nature take upon men and States that presume to discard those laws and to set up their own base irregularities as the substitute for the norm of nature's rectitude.

Divorce makes impossible the employment of the means which nature has established for the attainment of an end. It destroys the natural conjugal society. It cuts away *a priori* the elements which nature has ordained to give that society its necessary stability and coherence—love, trust, harmony, coöperation, etc. It defeats the end of the society. It rules out the

right of the child to the united care of a father and a mother. It leaves the child to be born without a definite father. With the possibility of a divorce to-morrow, neither party will care for the duties of to-day, which have their great significance in that they tend to the end which is to have its attainment to-morrow.

It cannot be said that all or any of these things must be set down as fully approved by the natural law; yet if the justice of divorce be affirmed, they are all thereby declared to be in full accord with and approved by the natural law. Such a disposition of nature cannot be entertained. Therefore, it is in the order of nature that the lot of the married couple be cast together until death severs the bond. This is the natural law.

The chief objection that is made against the permanency of the contract is, that it requires a certain amount of self-restraint. No one will deny that patience, self-restraint, forbearance, watchfulness, and a host of virtues are required for the proper conduct of the matrimonial society. But these same are required for the proper conduct of any work that is worth engaging in. If every immorality is to be justified because self-restraint is required to keep it in check, and if thus self-restraint is to be ruled out of society, especially the self-restraint that is demanded in the married state, then human society must go to pieces. The difficulty of restraint will have just as much force to justify theft and murder as to justify adultery.

But what is to be said of divorce after the end is fulfilled, that is, after all the children have received their due and are settled in life? Even in this case nature has provided the circumstances which indicate her law. By long and faithful association, nature herself strengthens the bond and confirms the union. In the universal horror of humanity at such a thing as a divorce after so many years of love and of the virtues of domestic life, nature shows, without further argument, that there is in such a separation a hideousness revolting to the dullest human perception, and in this way she gives a practical promulgation to her law. There is nothing human that the natural instinct of humanity regards with greater sentiments of admiration and reverence than the picture of the aged couple faithful to the end in the love in which they entered on their career to

the fulfilment of nature's end; and there is nothing in human society from which humanity turns so universally in disgust as the grandsire deserting the companion of his life's fortunes—richer and poorer, better and worse, in sickness and health—to make an unholy, senile caricature of his repudiated love.

It is said that mutual love may grow cold. Then let men and women not rush to matrimony as to a street parade. Of course, the cooling of the love is at the root of every pretext. Make it the hidden justification in conscience, and you open the door to all the free love and fickleness of which the human heart is capable. It will loosen the rein to every passion which men and women can use to make home unbearable; it will foster wrath, peevishness, sullenness, cruelty, and every evil disposition which can be brought into play to bring about the repudiation of the bond. The common restraint demanded in every situation will be cast aside within the castle walls between man and wife, all in hope of coming to a state of things which may be regarded as a justifiable plea for the divorce. Thus the whole moral law is put in jeopardy, and human society is reduced to a condition lower than that of the brute animals that obey at least the instincts of nature.

Matrimony is a sacred, moral state, a field for virtue. It may not be made the ground for cruelty and licentiousness which necessarily follow the doctrine of divorce. There is no virtue in the house of the adulterous, nor in the house of those who are looking for the day when they can break the sacred tie and fly to unholy nuptials. Let us add that, if men can be bound in conscience by the mere civil law against inclinations that are not in themselves unlawful, and with an inconvenience not felt by other citizens, how much more are they bound by the natural and higher law to the conditions of a state which they have assumed freely under the provisions of the higher law!

What about infidelity? It may be a reason for separation, but never for a complete divorce. All that we have said about pretexts for dissolving the bond applies in the case of infidelity with hundredfold urgency. If infidelity were recognized under the natural law as a justification for the severance of the bond,

human society would soon be turned into something like a herd of free-lovers.

But it is objected again that matrimony is a contract. Yes, matrimony is a contract. And precisely as a contract must it under the natural law be governed by the conditions implied in the contract. It is under these conditions alone that the contract can be made. No particular individual is bound to make the contract. If anyone, however, does make it, he must make it subject to all the conditions which the nature and end of the contract demand.

As Christians, we may never lose sight of the fact that matrimony, though a contract, is a contract that has been raised to the dignity of a Sacrament of the Christian religion. Here, however, we are not considering it as a Sacrament. As a contract, then, in the ordinary course of human history it takes place in human society, that is to say, within the civil community. Nevertheless, it is a contract which takes place between individuals, and is prior to the formation and very notion of civil society. Civil authority, therefore, cannot touch it in its essentials. Civil authority can take cognizance of it, officially, only in regard to civil effects; and this cognizance will be, really, to the end of guarding the rights of the prior existing society and of the children.

Civil authority can demand that there be some external record of the marriage, some satisfactory certification of its existence, in order that the same authority may be able to determine, civilly, the rights of family and of children and the civil effects of heirship. It may also use its power to prevent disorder by the prosecution of polyandry and polygyny, whether simultaneous or successive; that is to say, whether exercised under the form of polygamy or of divorce. Moreover, if in a given community marriage between certain persons is positively incompatible with social order, the civil authority can refuse to give civil recognition to such marriage. This does not mean that the civil authority has the power to annul the marriage, but it can refuse to such marriage civil recognition for civil effects.

Outside of these purely social accidents and civil effects,

matrimony, in its essentials, whether considered as a contract in the natural order or as a contract raised to the dignity of a Sacrament, is totally independent of all civil jurisdiction. In the order of nature, matrimony as a contract is prior to the existence of civil society. It is the basis of civil society. It has its inalienable rights and duties which civil society is bound to respect and secure, as it would guard the conditions of its own existence. Civil society is for the individual. The individual is not for civil society. Civil society is for the temporal ends of the individual. Civil societies cease to be. The individual goes on to a higher life. The preparation of the individual for this higher life is committed to those who, in the order of nature, are responsible for his existence. To them he has to look for this, and not immediately to civil society. The man is first and essentially a being, an immortal and a member of the family, and only provisionally a member of the civil organization. And when civil authorities infringe upon the prior and inalienable rights of the aggregates, whether individual or domestic, of which societies are composed, such authorities become despotisms instead of being blessings to mankind.

The civil authority in some communities does presume to pronounce the marriage bond dissoluble, and to actually declare the dissolution, and to confer upon the parties the right to marry again; but the pronouncement is null and void. Civil authority has no power whatsoever over the natural law. It can no more annul the law that binds the married couple than it can annul the law of gravitation. Its action is simply criminal public countenance given to adultery, which is forbidden by the natural law. Even in its very presumption of power, the civil authority recognizes the importance of the bond by putting restrictions on the divorced and the pleas for divorce, thus recognizing that there is a higher law creating the bond which it presumes to break. The inconveniences which some persons may experience under a general and a higher law give no right to men to sit in judgment on the law, and to make and break and change the law.

Whenever civil legislators have presumed to trifle with na-

ture's law of marriage, they have created depravity of morals, and have loosened the very foundation stones of civil and social life which they were sworn to protect. The conditions of civil society, for which also man is intended by nature, demand absolutely the firmness of the marriage bond, which is its basis. The fact of the continuance of certain civil societies in the nineteenth century, notwithstanding the prevalence of divorce in them, make for nothing against this principle. Complete collapse and ruin of civil societies does not come in a day. The canker that is at the root of the social fever in many civil societies to-day is precisely the presumption of their lawmakers to legislate and decree over the very laws of nature in this matter of the bond of marriage. The public presumption to annul the laws of nature, and the consequent flagrant violation of those laws under the mantle of the civil statute, which should stand as the custodian of nature's laws in society, will bring its retribution. There is a nemesis, and it is at hand.

WILLIAM POLAND, S.J.

St. Louis University.

VINUM DE VITE: THE WINE OF THE MASS.

II.

LIKE other fruits, like corn and wheat, like the potato, sweet or Irish, like the tomato and the cauliflower, the grape has its good and bad seasons. In a bad year the vineyardist may have to face a short crop or a harvest of ill-ripened grapes. If his short crop were corn, wheat, or potatoes, he could not increase it; nor could he market it, being poor in quality, except at a price determined by the buyer, and based on a comparison between middling, less than middling, and good. The vineyardist is not necessarily bound by the law that restricts the farmer. All grapes the vineyardist views as wine, and wine to him is cash. He will press his few grapes or his poor grapes. Of the juice, fermenting or fermented, he will increase the

quantity, perhaps. Fermenting or fermented, should it be unmarketable, he may take means to make it marketable. Choosing the least objectionable means, he will sophisticate the poor stuff he has in the vat, the cask, or the butt.

Neither to the sun, nor to the winds, may the defects of a wine be due, but, indeed, to the ignorance or the neglect of the vineyardist, who has not cultivated the soil, or cared for the vines or the must duly. Having slighted the vine or been otherwise negligent, will he contemn or condemn the acrid, feeble, unsalable juice housed in his cellar—a cellar that may be faulty? Experience teaches that, neither condemning nor contemning, he will, too often, cover his own negligence by sophistication, and thus turn into wine what should and would have been vinegar. Whether sophisticated or pure, wines customarily reach a market through a vintner, whose credit and profit depend on his ability to please his clients by giving them, always, something that tastes like the latest compound they had from him. The palate of his client he tickles and his own credit and profit he maintains, too often, by sophistication.

Certain sophistications are assumed to be, commercially, very proper; and among these we note first: blending or mixing. This method of bettering a pure wine that would not have matured, or of turning a cheap wine into a higher-priced wine, or of rendering marketable a wine once unmarketable, or of "doctoring" a spoiled wine, invites the attention of the moral theologian as well as of the connoisseur. We shall confine ourselves to the question of blending, as it affects the matter of the *vinum de vite* licit in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass; though, to illustrate the subject, we shall not despise the views of the connoisseur.

Within the limits of each country, the wines of one county, State, department, province, are mixed freely with wine from other departments, States, provinces, counties; and the wines of one country, likewise, are blended with wines of other countries. "The amount of mixing carried on at Bordeaux"—we quote the words of Dr. Thudichum—"is incredible; for its exports are twelve times as great as the production of the entire Médoc, and one-half of these exports sells as Bordeaux wine, so that it is quite fair to assume that the Gironde

wine is multiplied several times by the addition or substitution of other wines of France."[1]

Most intelligently, the characteristics of the wines of every locality in France have been studied. One may be poor in color, but rich in alcohol; it is chosen to tone up a wine deficient in alcohol though good in color. Another is thin, acid; with it a full, sweet wine is blended. Still another is souring, rottening; to it a half-dozen healthier wines will be prescribed as remedies, each contributing a share of health to the patient—one strengthening, one sweetening, correcting, one coloring the diseased wine. The term "doctoring" became popular only when the artist-blenders, vain of their art, popularized the word. Wines of the Gironde, wines of the Saône and the Rhône, wines of the Loire, of Burgundy, of Roussillon, of Languedoc, wines of every shade of white and red, are transported here, there, everywhere, within the French borders, solely for blending. By the artful intermingling of various wines, the vineyardist or the vintner creates a wine so resembling a genuine natural wine, or so like the good wine of some noted vineyard or section, that the clients, paying well, are fully satisfied by a deceptive label and a pleasing *gout*. There are French wines having no market other than the blender's market. The wines of Languedoc, according to a recognized authority, are classed, generally under the name of *Vins du Midi;* and "to the ignorant this name is the equivalent of cheap, bad stuff." As a matter of fact, these wines are exported to all parts of France, and they are "mixed with the Burgundies, the Bordeaux, and other varieties of French wine drunk in the country or exported."[2]

"Hermitage" is a name to conjure with, and we mention it just because the natural wine is so good and so rare. "Red Hermitage goes to Bordeaux"—again we quote a safe authority—"to be mixed with the colder growths of the Gironde; its first qualities are never sold in the trade as such, just because of the value which they possess for adulterating Bordeaux wines."[3]

[1] *Origin, Nature, and Use of Wines*, p. 333.
[2] Thudichum, *loc. cit.*, p. 391.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 411.

"Adulteration" is the term applied by Dr. Thudichum to the mixing of wines. We have used the word "sophistication." The Doctor is not wholly right and we are not wholly wrong. Last year a vineyardist, through no fault of his own, obtained a wine, not bad, but yet not as good as it should be. This year his vintage is bodied, spirited, well-flavored. With the less good wine of last year, he mixes the good wine of this year; and of course his main motive is profit. The two, the three wines *may* coalesce, ripen, and in time mature into a wine sound and savory. Natural wine has been blended with natural wine; and, as we suppose, an honest, intelligent overseer has controlled the wines and knows, of his own knowledge, that each of them is pure. Surely this is not "adulteration." The exacting connoisseur will call a wine thus blended a "sophisticated" wine; but the Church is considerate. Blended wines, provided they be sound natural wines, and that no extraneous matter has been added to them, are licitly used as "Altar wines."

The exacting connoisseur, however, stands on firm ground, and so does Dr. Thudichum. Ordinarily the vineyardist or the vintner, for the process of blending, buys a wine or wines that he has no control over; nor is he too inquisitive about their purity. "Business is business." The chances are, as we shall see, that the wine bought from the stranger is adulterated. Blending an adulterated wine with one needing correction, the resultant wine will be an adulterated wine. Dr. Thudichum's term, therefore, was not ill-chosen. Safely we may assume that almost all the ordinary commercial wines are adulterated wines.

We have not done with the connoisseur. His ideal is one of purity and also of genuineness. The wine he would drink should be a wine from the vines of one vineyard, or, at least, of one territory; a wine born in a determined year; and, always, a matured wine—pure juice of the grape, rightly fermented. The false name labelled on a blended wine he will resent. He desires to drink pure St. Emilion or pure Pontet Canet—not the name, but the thing. Rightly he may call blending, deceitful blending, a "sophistication." Let us repeat, however, that pure wines, honestly blended, are licitly used in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

Commercial wines, we have said, are adulterated wines as well as blended wines. The ports and sherries exported to the United States or elsewhere are, in almost every instance, mixed wines. Not many years ago, the Mayor of Jerez de la Frontera described the wine cellars of the neighborhood as "mysterious laboratories, whose secrets no one is allowed to penetrate," and furthermore, he declared that "the spurious wines usurp (the place of) the genuine wines."[4] The wines used by the mixers in Portugal and Spain are selected with a freedom and an expertness not surpassed in France.[5] To enter into details concerning the sophistication of the wines familiarly known as port and sherry should be unnecessary, so generally is the system in vogue among the vintners known to inquirers, and so thoroughly have the processes been exposed by authoritative writers. Like the commercial wines of other countries, the wines that are transmuted into sherries or ports come into the hands of the vintners either as grapes or as musts, bought in gross from the vineyardist, or as *new* wines, unripe wines, wines whose fermentation has not been completed. Noting again that neither art, nor Science, nor greed, is the monopoly of any nation, we dismiss the wines of Hungary and of Italy. Of the Rhine wines we should say, however, that, barring the few famous brands, these wines escape sophistication, by reckless blending, no more than those of Bordeaux. In Germany, Science has been most generous to the vineyardist and the wine merchant, who, on their part, have endeavored, successfully, to bring no discredit to their cunning benefactor.

The purpose of the blender of wines, even of pure wines, is, very often, to make a speedy market for an immature wine. Whatever their purity, blended wines are subject to fermentations. Mixing, they decompose; and the process of recomposition is, at least, as uncertain as in the case of the fermenting juice expressed from ripe grapes. If the blended wine, however good, be not held in the cask for years, as a natural

[4] *Vide* the London *Times*, Aug. 30, 1888.

[5] We refer the reader to Thudichum, *loc. cit.*, pp. 651, 677; *Facts about Sherry:* H. Vizetelly, pp. 50–53; *Facts about Port:* Vizetelly, pp. 119–120; *The Wine Press and Cellar*, pp. 112, 120–124; *The Wines of the World:* Vizetelly, p. 131.

wine should be, the process of fermentation will be completed in the stomach of the drinker—a receptacle that nature, evidently, does not favor equally with the butt or the cask.

A word from a moderate defender of the mixing of pure wines, M. Maigne, will suggest the risks one runs when buying the mixed wines of commerce. Premising that the mixing of wines is practised by producers as well as by dealers, in order to correct the defects of thin, or rough, or flat wines, and expressing the opinion that such an operation is quite "natural," he adds, very justly, that it gives rise to objections of all sorts and awakens suspicion, because, "performed by dishonest hands of which, unfortunately, there are too many, it so favors fraud that it is almost impossible to fix the line at which honesty ends and deceit commences."[6]

Thus far, we have been seeking information concerning the mixing of Spanish wines with Spanish wines, of Portuguese with Portuguese, of French with French. In no country, though, do the blenders confine themselves to the mixing of native wines. On the Continent, Spanish, Italian, and American wines are mingled with French growths. What is done at Cette and at Marseilles, where they manufacture everything vinous into everything else, except what it once was, even the simplest American should know; for Cette and Marseilles have blended—adulterated is the word here—willingly, expansively, in order that our educated and exacting taste might be satiated.

Though the more famous, these are not the only laboratories in France. A dozen years ago—in a year producing a short crop—the quantity of wine made in France, according to statistics prepared by the Commissioners of Indirect Taxes, amounted to 546,797,900 gallons. From dry raisins and the dregs of the winepress 123,000,000 gallons of so-called wine were made. And yet, during the same year, 260,595,000 gallons of foreign wines were imported into the country. From Spain one-half of the imports were derived. Italy supplied a third of the other half.[7] Add a laboratory to a laboratory,

[6] *Nouveau Manuel*, etc., p. 318.

[7] London *Times*, Jan. 5, 1888; *The Saturday Review*, Aug. 16, 1884; Thudichum, pp. 333, 381–388; 396–398; 652–658; *Facts about Sherry*, pp. 94–99; *Facts about Port*, pp. 25, 141–146.

and a laboratory remains. Sherries are compounded in France, as are port wines in Spain. At the London docks the many-blended are reblended, and we have other reblenders nearer home.

Seeking relief from the *ennui* induced by long viewing these innumerable and subtle works of art, let us turn once again to the ingenuous achievements of Science. In France, a hundred years ago and more, chemists as well as vineyardists endeavored to make up for the natural defect of musts pressed from unripe grapes. As the result of various experiments, the chemists and the vineyardists agreed that, by freely adding sugar and water to the musts, a wretched mixture could be changed into a potable wine. In the juice of an unripe grape there is an excess of acid and a deficiency of grape sugar. Adding water, the acidity was diminished; the lack of grape sugar was supplied by cane sugar. M. Chaptal, one of the first of popularizing chemists, and a Minister under the Directory, encouraged this form of adulteration; and, diversely modified, this fashion of "improving" wines was practised by advanced vintagers in and out of France, until M. Abel Petiot de Chamirey introduced a more effective and economic method of turning sugar and water into wine. At the bottom of the vat holding a must, there lies a mass of grape-skins, stems, and of other undissolved substances, a mass properly known as "the murk," "the marc," "the pomace," and, less properly, as "the husks," or "the lees," or "the dregs." M. Petiot de Chamirey, having first drawn off the fermenting fluid, thus assuring a fair share of good or middling wine, distributed a measured quantity of cane sugar over the murk, and then poured in water. When this solution had fermented, it was drawn off; and as it looked, tasted, nay, smelled like wine, the brilliant Frenchman boldly dosed the murk a second time with sugared water. Drawing off this new solution, imagine his delight at finding that it also smelled, tasted, and looked like wine. Only a genius would have risked soaking the drenched murk a third time. M. Petiot did not cease even then. A fourth and a fifth time he sweetened and irrigated; and the last tincture tasted, smelled, looked like wine. Had M. Petiot permitted his

must to become natural wine, he would have had but one-fifth of the liquid he acquired by his process. Nor was it in quantity alone that he gained. His washed wine did not spoil easily; it demanded less care. "Many persons have tasted these wines, have found them good, and have not been able to distinguish them from the wines pressed from the grapes directly, and yet they cost but one-third of the price of the latter. . . . The best grapes or finest growths, when treated according to Petiot's process, yield the greatest advantages; for that which remains best to the very end of the operation is the bouquet—the particular flavor that distinguishes each situation and each product, and which gives it its value." [8]

Nigh fifty years have passed since M. Petiot de Chamirey was instigated to "improve" grape-skins, grape-stems, the murk, and, at last, even the dregs, by means of the *adulteration* we have curtly described. We do not wish to diminish the fame of Antoine Alexis François de Vaux, or of M. Maguet or M. Macquer, or M. Maupin, or of Messieurs Lenoir, Payen, Dumont, Dubrunfaut, Maumené—forerunners or assistants of M. Petiot; nor would we deprive German Science of whatever credit be due to it for adapting French methods to the "improvement" of German wines, by the use of cane sugar, long before Petiot disclosed his profitable secret. Dr. Ritter, Dr. Doebereiner, G. C. Bartels, Professor Balling, Baron von Babo, Dr. Fresenius, J. C. Leuchs, and even a Medical Commission authorized by the Prussian Government, had favored the Chaptalization of wines before Petiotization was discovered. To-day, Petiotizing is practised the world over. Doubtless, at least one connoisseur among our acquaintances has been captivated by the exquisitely fragrant "bouquet" of a Petiotized wine—sugar-water-wine.

A German, Dr. L. Gall, claims and receives credit for having fabricated German wines a quarter of a century before Petiot, using sugared water after the Frenchman's fashion. Quoting the German chemist, we shall do him no injustice: "Having devoted considerable time and pains to experimenting on wines, and different methods of making and amelio-

[8] Thudichum, *loc. cit.*, p. 113.

rating them, I came, in the year 1828, upon the idea of trying whether I could not produce a drinkable wine, *without using any grapes at all for the purpose;* and, verily, I succeeded far beyond my expectation. I took nothing but grape-twigs, chopped into pieces and allowed them to ferment with half an ohm of sugar-water. The result was a very palatable wine. . . . In subsequent years I made repeated experiments by adding sugar-water to musts, thereby not only increasing the quantity by 20 to 30 per cent., but also improving the quality." [9] Only twenty-two years later did Dr. Gall feel justified in publishing his essay: "On the Manner of Making Very Good Medium Wines Even from Unripe Grapes."

M. Petiot having bounteously—I hesitate to say disinterestedly—taken the vineyardists and vintners into his confidence about this time, Dr. Gall undertook to systematize, scientifically, the French experiments, which were not precise. Guessing, not calculation, determined M. Petiot's contributions of sugar and water to the murk. The German chemist devised instruments and machines to aid the vineyardist in the fabrication of salable "wines" from unripe grapes, from murks and from husks. Besides, he prepared "tables," fixing the amount of sugar and of water to be added to the murks and musts, according to their tested acidity. Nor did Dr. Gall rest here. Devising a cheaper method of "improving" wines, he acquired new fame as an original "Improver;" and now Gallized wines are as common in the markets of the world as Petiotized wines, and probably more common.

On the natural sugar of the grape the name "glucose" was long ago conferred; the general opinion being that the natural sugar of grapes was "of a peculiar kind, though it is now thought to be a compound of two different kinds of sugar—fruit sugar and grape sugar." [10] Cane sugar is not found in wine, and, therefore, M. Petiot was more liberal with his murk than Nature has been to any variety of grapes. The notion of supplying artificial grape sugar to musts lacking in the natural sugar of wine had appealed to French vineyardists

[9] *Grape Culture, Wine and Wine-Making:* Haraszthy, pp. 271–272.

[10] Thudichum, *loc. cit.*, p. 222.

before Dr. Gall ventured to make the process his own. Indeed, grape sugar factories were not innumerous, even in Germany, at the time of Petiot's improvement. Under the name of glucose, commercial grape sugar has been "improved" by the chemist; and, nowadays, glucose does not always deserve the old familiar appellation of "potato sugar." Where the chemist finds starch, the capitalist will try to make commercial glucose profitably."

Replacing cane sugar, or ancient grape sugar, by modern glucose, Dr. Gall has further "improved" the wines of the world; and he offers the testimony of respectable men to prove that, by a proper application of his method, the net result will be not merely a tenfold increase in the profit of the fabricator, but even a twentyfold increase. Such is the premium offered by Science to the owner of every vineyard—a premium to which that tendered to the artist in blending is not comparable. He mixes a something that has in it, or that has had in it, the fermenting or the fermented juice of grapes; but the disciple of Dr. Gall may water must, or murk, or husks, or dregs, as best pleaseth him. From one or the other he will extract a cellar-full of "improved" wine.

M. Petiot was a Burgundian. We mention the fact lest it might be assumed that the vintners at Bordeaux were cleverer than the vineyardists of other portions of France. As for the vintners of the Rhineland, Dr. Gall will speak for them. "Experience has taught us," he said, "in all the German grape districts, that a proportionable addition of water and sugar forms the means to produce, even from the most sour must, as drinkable and as good a wine as is otherwise produced in good medium seasons." One counsel of the illustrious Doctor will commend itself to squeamish folk: "Neither water from still-standing ponds nor from foul wells should be used." [11]

Petiotizing and Gallizing we have numbered among adulterations; though, fairly, the wine fabricated by either process might be termed *artificial*. M. Petiot, it will be remembered,

[11] As to these processes, *cf.* Thudichum, pp. 110–119; *The Cultivation of the Native Grape*, etc., George Husmann, pp. 149–173; Haraszthy, *loc. cit.*, pp. 234–297; *The Wine Press and Cellar*, pp. 13–18; Reemelin, *loc. cit.*, p. 44.

washed a sugared murk five times and was satisfied with the fifth dilution. After ten sweetened baths other experimenters have found their wine drinkable. However, the color varies with each bath, and a careful man, who is anxious to have the color just right, may have to use drugs now and then.

"When this method was first introduced"—we quote an American maker of wines—"it was calumniated and despised, called adulteration of wine, and even prohibited by the governments of Europe; but Dr. Gall fearlessly challenged his opponents to have his wines analyzed by the most eminent chemists, which was repeatedly done, and the results showed that they contained nothing but such ingredients as pure wines should contain; and since men like Von Babo, Doebereiner, and others have openly endorsed and recommended Gallizing, prejudice is giving way before the light of scientific knowledge."[12]

"The light of scientific knowledge!" we exclaim, recalling both the Angels and the "ineffable and tremendous Sacrifice." Can it be that the citizens of Heaven, who hate even negligence, will commend as scientific the artifices, trickeries, frauds of selfish fabricators, veritable alchemists who do indeed turn base things into gold! Whatever commerce may owe to the so-called "light of scientific knowledge," by which the doctoring blender, the Petiotizer, the Gallizer, are illuminated, those whose privilege it is to guard the honor and the worship of the most Holy Sacrifice will seek a steadier, a clearer, a whiter light.

JOHN A. MOONEY.

New York, N. Y.

LUKE DELMEGE: IDIOTA.[1]

VI.—ADIEUX.

MORTIFIED and irritated, vexed at himself for his shortcomings, savage with others for their unkindness, Luke passed into the drawing-room. Somehow, his anger gave a tinge of pallor to his brown, healthy face, that made him look

[12] Husmann, *loc. cit.*, p. 148.

[1] *Copyright*, 1900, by the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

quite interesting; and it was with something like kindness that Mrs. Wilson beckoned him to a seat near herself on the sofa, and chatted affably with him for a few moments. She also engaged his services in helping around the tea from a dainty wicker-work table; and he was beginning to feel a little more comfortable, though still determined to escape at the first opportunity, when the Canon asked him abruptly to turn over the leaves of the music on the piano, at which Barbara was now seated. Luke was about to excuse himself by saying with perfect truth that he knew nothing about music; but in a weak moment he rose, and whilst Miss Wilson's fingers wandered over the keys, he stood, statue-like and motionless, near her. In a few seconds she nodded, and he turned the leaf with the air of an expert; and then the full absurdity of the situation broke suddenly upon him, and dyed neck and face and up to the roots of hair in deep crimson of shame and confusion. For he remembered that at the last retreat, a picture of a worldly priest was held up to their reprobation—a picture, not too highly colored, but grimly painted by a strong and merciless hand. There it was, lurid and ghastly, or pitifully ludicrous, as you choose or your mood may be—the limp, unmuscular, feminine, artificial priest, who, with all the insignia of Christ and the Cross, is perpetually aping the manners and customs of the world, and in dress and manner and conversation is forever changing and shifting, like a mime on the stage; and the culmination of all this nimble coquetry is when he leans over the keys of a young lady's piano, turns over the leaves of her music, and sings "Champagne Charlie," and "Not for Joe." Ah! Luke! Luke! and hither hast thou come, even on the day of thy first Mass. Burning with shame and self-scorn, he had sense enough left to whisper, "You will excuse me!" and retreated ignominiously to a corner, where, over the pages of an album, he thought unutterable things. He woke up, after what appeared to be an hour, by hearing the Canon say:

"That duet from—ah—*Trovatore*, Barbara; or, perhaps, Louis would sing, "Hear Me—ha—Gentel Maritana!"

The two voices blended beautifully, and at another time Luke would have listened with pleasure, but not to-night. Oh,

no! it has been a day of humiliation and suffering, and even the gentle spirit of Music for once fails to bring peace and healing on her wings.

There was a hushed and whispered colloquy between Barbara and her mother, and then the former, with some hesitation, approached to where Luke was sitting, and said timidly, holding her hands pleadingly before her:

"Mother would like to hear you sing, Father. I'm sure you sing well—"

"I assure you, Miss Wilson, I'm quite unaccustomed to—"

"Now, I know you have a lovely baritone from the way you said the 'Prayers' to-day. Do, Father!"

What could he sing? "Believe Me, If All?" Hush! "Oh! Doth Not a Meeting Like This Make Amends?" Absurd! "There's a Bower of Roses by Bendameer's Stream?" Sickly and sentimental! Yes, he will, by Jove! He'll take a subtle revenge by ruffling the placidity of this smooth and aristocratic circle. Won't they laugh when they hear it at home? Won't Father Pat smite his leg like a Vulcan, and declare that it was the best thing he ever heard in his life? But it will be impolite and shocking! No matter! Here goes!

And drawing himself up to his full height, and leaning one arm on the mantelpiece, Luke sang out in the noble baritone, that had often echoed at Christmas plays around the gloomy halls of Maynooth—

From Howth away to famed Dunboy,
By Kerry's beetling coasts,
With lightning speed the summons flew
To marshal Freedom's hosts.
From Limerick's old historic walls
To Boyne's ill-omened tide
The long-watched signal swelled their hearts } *bis.*
With Vengeance, Hope, and Pride. }

The Canon was gasping and his face lengthening as in a spoon; the ladies smiled in horror; Apollo looked up, angry and contemptuous; Griffiths was about to say:

"Now, you know, Father Delmege, that's rank treason, you know"—but on went Luke, his rich voice thundering out the song of rebellion in the ears of these excellent loyalists:

They're mustering fast—see, Slievenamon
  Its serried lines displays;
Mark how their burnished weapons gleam
  In morning's ruddy blaze;
While proudly floats the flashing green
  Where purl the Mague and Lee.
Hurrah! my boys, we've lived, thank God, } *bis.*
  To set the Old Land free!

The Canon was shocked beyond expression; yet a tender old-time feeling seemed to film his eyes, for the Mague was rolling past his door, and the summit of Slievenamon could be seen from the window. Luke rapidly shook hands with the ladies, whilst Barbara, in her enthusiasm, asked:

"Who wrote it? You *must* give me the words and the music, Father! 'Tis worth all the operas ever written."

He nodded to Griffiths, took no notice of the Apollo, shook hands with the Canon and thanked him for his hospitality, and dashed out into the cool air with a throbbing heart and a burning forehead.

He was pushing along in his swift striding way, and had reached the road, when he heard a flutter of silk behind him; and there was Barbara Wilson, a little out of breath and very white. He waited.

"Father," she said, pleadingly, "I understand you are going on the English mission?"

"Yes," he said, wonderingly.

"Might I ask where will you be?"

"I cannot say," he said, "but in one of the southeastern counties."

"Thank God," she said fervently. Then after some hesitation, and gulping down some emotion, "I want you to make a promise."

"If I may."

"You may meet my brother in England. He is in Brighton, an assistant to a physician there. He goes up to London three times a week to St. Thomas' Hospital. If you meet him, will you be kind?"

"I'm not much attracted by your brother, Miss Wilson," Luke said bluntly.

"I know; but you are a priest, and his soul is at stake. You do not know, but I am afraid that he is—that he is—oh! my God! weak in his faith. You may be able to help him!"

"Of course, if I come across him in the course of my ministrations—"

"The Good Shepherd *sought out* the lost sheep," said Barbara.

"But, you know, one does not like a repulse," said Luke.

"It is a question of a soul," said Barbara, her eyes filling with tears.

"Say no more, Miss Wilson," said Luke, "you shame me. I heard your brother give expression to some shocking things this evening; and I confess I conceived a strong and violent aversion to him; but now that you have appealed—"

"Thank you, oh, so much! And there's something else about poor Louis—"

She put her fingers to her lip, musing. Then, after a pause, she said: "Never mind. You'll find it out for yourself; but you promise?"

"I promise," he said.

"And you won't allow his arrogance and pride to repel you?"

"I hope not," said Luke.

"God bless you!" she said fervently, clasping his hand.

"Hallo, old man! Alive and kicking?" was the cheery welcome of Father Pat, who, snugly ensconced in a capacious armchair in the parlor at Lisnalee, was stroking down the fair curls of a little lad, an orphan child of a younger brother, whom Mike Delmege had adopted. How calm, and simple, and homely the little parlor looked to Luke's eyes, dazzled and dimmed by the splendors of the Canon's house, and half-blinded from the emotions aroused during the evening. The image remained imprinted on the retentive retina of Luke's memory for many a day, and came up, amongst strange scenes and sights, to comfort him with its holy beauty. Often, in after years, when sitting at the tables of noblemen, who traced their blood back to the invaders, who bit the sands at Hastings, that

cloud-dream of his seaside home rose soft and beautiful as a piece of enchantment raised to the witchery of soft music; and often, on the streets of Southwark at midnight, when the thunder of the mighty stream of humanity rolled turbid and stormy along the narrow streets, did he see, as in a far-off picture, narrowed in the perspective of memory, the white farmhouse above the breakers, and the calm, beautiful, twilight holiness that slept above it—a canopy of peace and rest. He saw the two windows that ventilated the parlor—the one looking northward over soft gray meadows and golden cornfields, that stretched away till they were lost in the purple and blue of the shadowy, mysterious mountains; the other looking southward over masses of purple heather, to where the everlasting sea shimmered in silver all day long, and put on its steel-blue armor against the stars of night. There was the tea-table, with its cups and saucers and its pile of dainty griddle-cakes, cut in squares, and fresh from the hands of Margery; and golden butter, the best that was made in the *Golden Vale;* and thick, rich cream; and fragrant strawberries, nestling in their grape-like leaves. And there was his good father, a stern old Irish Catholic of the Puritan type, silent and God-fearing and just, who never allowed a day to pass without an hour of silent communion with God, in his bedroom after the midday meal, and on whose lands the slightest whisper of indelicacy was punished by immediate expulsion. There sat the kindly mother, her beautiful white hair arranged under her snowy cap, and the eternal beads in her hands. There, gliding to and fro, was Margery—a perfect Martha of housewifely neatness and alertness; and Lizzie, the grave, thoughtful Mary of the household; and there was Father Pat, best and kindest and truest of friends, to whose arms children sprang for affection, and in whose hands the wildest collie or sheepdog was glad to lay his wet nozzle, after he had valorously defended his premises. Luke flung himself into the armchair by the southern window, and asked Margery for a "decent cup of tea."

"Well, I suppose now you are fit to dine with the Duke of N—," said Father Pat. "You have passed your entrance examination into decent society to-night."

"It wasn't so severe an ordeal as I supposed," said Luke. "The Canon was kind; and Miss Wilson—"

Margery paused with the teapot high in air.

"Miss Wilson made everything easy."

Margery drew a long, deep breath of doubt, and shook her head.

"Do you know what I think, Father Pat?" said Luke.

"No. Go on," said Father Pat.

"That there's a lot of real kindness under all the Canon's formalism; and that he is at heart a good-natured man."

"Humph!" said Father Pat. "How did you come to that conclusion? For I have longer experience of him than you, and I have not reached it yet."

"Well, I don't know," replied Luke. "It is a little thing; but it is little things that tell. A straw, you know. I was singing—"

"You were singing?" said Father Pat.

"Did you really sing?" said Margery.

"What did you sing, Father Luke?" said Lizzie, who was a more obedient pupil than her sister.

"I was just saying that when I was singing 'The Muster'"—

Father Pat jumped from his chair.

"You don't mean to say that you sang that red-hot rebel song in the Canon's presence?" he said.

"Every line of it," replied Luke, "and I have promised the words and the music to Barbara Wilson." He looked in a quizzical way at his sister.

"Well, I'm blessed," said Father Pat, resuming his seat, "but that beats Banagher. Wait till I tell Tim and Martin."

He looked at Luke with a certain feeling of awe during the rest of the evening.

"Well, I was saying," said Luke coolly, "that I thought—perhaps 'twas only imagination—that the Canon's eyes softened, and that something like kindliness came into them, as from the memory of the past."

"Ay, indeed! and so well there might," said Mrs. Delmege. "I well remember when there wasn't a more tender or more

loving priest in the diocese than you, Father Maurice Murray. Sure 'twas well known that his sister had to lave him because he had not two shoes alike; and he used to stale the mate out of the pot to give it to the poor."

"I mind well the day," said old Mike Delmege, in a musing way, as if he was trying to call up a fast-vanishing picture, "when he wint in, and took up that poor girl, Bride Downey (she is now the mother of the finest childhre in the parish), out of her sick-bed, sheets, blankets, and all, and she reeking with the typhus, the Lord betune us and harm, and spotted all over like the measles, and took her over and put her in the van for the hospital, while all the people stood away in fright, and even the man from the workhouse wouldn't go near her. And it was you, Canon Murray, that arranged her bed in that workhouse van; and sure you took the faver, and went near dying yourself at the time."

"He's not the same man, Mike, since thin. They say the faver turned his head, and he got tetched," said Mrs. Delmege.

"No! but his grand sister, who ran away from the sickness, and wint up to Dublin, where she got into a castle or something, and married a big man, 'tis she that turned the poor man's head."

"I wish she had turned it the right way," said Father Pat, "for certainly 'tis screwed on the wrong way now."

"Father Martin says, too, that he is a rale good man under all his airs and nonsense—"

"Father Martin? No one minds him," said Father Pat; "he'd speak well of an informer or a landgrabber."

"Why, thin, now, Father Pat, no one knows as well as your reverence that there 'ud be many a poor family on the roadside to-day but for the same Canon. Sure they say that when they see his grand writing up in Dublin, with the turkey-cock on the top of the letther, and two swords crossed, that they'd give him all he ever asked for. And sure whin the Widow Gleeson was served last autumn, and there was nothing before her but the workhouse, and the Canon wrote to the agent, but he had only plain paper without the

turkey-cock, they took no more notice of him than if he was an ordinary pôor counthry parish priest. What did he do? He took the train up to Dublin, and walked into the office. Phew! whin they saw his grand figure, they ran into rat-holes before him. Believe you me, Father Pat, there are very few priests in the country can make the Canon's boast, that no little child will ever sleep in his parish without a cover betune it and the stars."

"That's all right, Mike," said Father Pat; "but why doesn't he keep his grand airs for grand people?—"

"Why," said Mike Delmege, "sure he must practise; and where would he practise but on you and me?"

"Well, he might keep them for Sundays and holidays," said Margery, who hated the whole lot, "or when his grand sister and niece come down from Dublin, and speak plain to plain people."

"True, Margery," said Father Pat; "we're a plain, simple people, and we want plain, simple priests."

But somehow Margery didn't like that either.

"Luke," said Father Pat, buttoning up his coat, "do you mean to say you're not joking, and that you sang 'The Muster' to-night?"

"I was never so serious in my life," said Luke.

"You sang it all?"

"Every line!"

"Down to—

> 'No more as craven slaves we bend
> To despot, king, or queen;
> God shields the right,—strike sure and fast,
> 'Tis for our native Green.'"

"Quite so!"

"And he didn't get a fit?"

"Not up to the time I was leaving."

"Well, he has got one now. I'll have a sick-call to him to-night. By Jove! what will Tim and Martin say? Well, let me see! You're off on Friday. Tim will have you to-morrow; Martin on Tuesday; you'll be with me on Wednesday. We'll leave him to you, ma'am, on Thursday. Is that all right?"

"All right," said Luke.

"The best creature that ever lived," said Mrs. Delmege, as Father Pat strolled down the moonlit field. Just at the stile he thought of something and came back. They were all kneeling, and Luke was reciting the Rosary. Father Pat heard the murmur of the voices, and paused. And there outside the window he took out his own Rosary beads and joined in that blessed prayer that echoes night after night from end to end of Ireland. Then he stole away quietly and mounted the stile.

"By Jove!" he said to himself, as he crossed shadow after shadow from the trees on the high hedges, "I believe he's in earnest. But who'd ever believe it? What will Tim and Martin say? We'll be talking about it till Christmas."

On Tuesday Luke called to see the Canon and make his adieux. He was not quite so nervous as on previous occasions, but he expected to receive a severe reprimand and a long lecture on his future conduct. Nor was he disappointed.

"I think it my duty," said the Canon, after they had exchanged preliminaries, "to say—ha—that there were a few things at our little—domestic meeting on Sunday, which I—ha—could hardly approve of. Is it possible that you were never—ha—instructed by your professors to rise with the ladies after dinner, and hold the door open as they—ha—departed?"

"It is not only possible, but a fact," said Luke, with the old contentious spirit of logic-chopping coming back to him. "Besides, sir, I was engrossed at the time, and didn't hear you say 'Grace.'"

This was really good for Luke; but he didn't see how his rapier struck home.

"I can really hardly credit it," said the Canon. "It is painful to reflect that we alone should be supposed to learn,—by—ha—some kind of intuition, the amenities of social intercourse."

The Canon was so pained that for a few moments there was dead silence, broken only by the ticking of the clocks.

"Then," he resumed, at length, "your *rencontre* with my—ha—clever nephew was hardly a happy one. I thought the inter-relations between body and spirit were part of your—ha—philosophical curriculum."

"Your nephew was Christian enough to deny that there was such a thing as soul at all," said Luke, flushing. The idea of being catechised on philosophy by this old man, who probably had never heard of any more recent writer than Tongiorgi or Liberatore! And all this to a "First of First!"

"Ha! that was only for a post-prandial argument," laughed the Canon. "But you lost temper and got confused. And you never heard of these—ha—Odic forces? Dear me! What are our professors doing? And what singular equipments they furnish our young men for the battle of life!"

There was another spell of silence, during which Luke drew up to the bar of justice, and solemnly condemned his professors as a set of "effete old fossils."

"I should hardly," said the Canon, resuming, "care to allude to that—ah—ill-timed and rather vulgar—melody to which you treated us; but you are—ha—going to England, and your mission will be—ha—inoperative and ineffectual if you import into the ministrations of your daily ministry such treasonable principles as those contained in that—ha—street-ballad. You were never taught operatic music in Maynooth?"

"No, sir," said Luke; "it was sternly interdicted."

"Dear me! how reactionary! And it is so—ha—refining. Did you notice that pretty duet, *Ai nostri monti?*" The Canon placed the tips of his fingers together.

"Yes, it was pretty," murmured Luke.

"And my nephew's rendering of *Hear me gen—tel Maritana?*"

"I did not follow that," said Luke.

"And then to compare that fiery *Marseillaise*, which you so unwisely, but, indeed, rather melodiously rendered! Do you think now really—ha—that *Hurrah, me boys*, is an expression suited to a drawing-room audience, or do you not see that it would be more fitting in a street-corner ballad or the heavy atmosphere of a—ha—taproom?"

Luke was silent and angry.

"It is quite possible," continued the Canon, "that you will be thrown a good deal into—ha—English society. You may be invited to dine with the—ha—aristocracy, or even the—ha—

nobility. I hope, my dear young friend, that you will never forget yourself so far as to introduce into such lofty and refined circles such dithyrambic and—ha—revolutionary ballads as that under discussion."

Luke said nothing, but continued tracing the pattern of the carpet.

"You must sink your extreme national sensibilities," said the Canon, "in the superior ambitions of the Church, and take care not to offend the prejudices of our dear English brethren by too-pronounced references to those—ha—political issues on which we—ha—differ."

There was truth in all that the Canon was saying, though put rather brutally, and Luke had only to listen. Then there was a surprising change of front.

"I have written to the bishop and obtained the requisite permission for you to celebrate three Masses in your father's house, not only now, but on all subsequent occasions when you may—ha—be resident in your paternal home—"

"Oh, thank you so much, Canon," said Luke, most gratefully; "that's a great favor."

The Canon went on, not noticing the ebullition.

"As I was saying—ha—I think this arrogation of rights that are parochial seems hardly consistent with Canon Law; but I have not insisted too warmly on my privileges as parish priest, lest I should seem wanting in the respect due to the lofty dignity of the episcopal bench. But I took—ha—the opportunity of remonstrating with His Lordship for having set aside one of my parishioners, and selected one of rather mediocre abilities, if I am rightly informed, for a position in the diocesan seminary which demands both talent and character."

Luke was at first bewildered. Then he saw through the Canon's kindness beneath his coat of buckram.

"I'm sure I'm greatly obliged to you, sir, for such trouble. I confess I did feel some annoyance at first, but now I should prefer to go to England."

"And I quite approve of your decision," said the Canon suavely; "indeed, it is one of the chief regrets of my life

that I was unable to graduate on the English mission. Nevertheless, the slight to my parishioner remains, and I shall not forget it."

Here the Canon sank into a reverie, as if meditating a subtle revenge against the bishop.

"Do you know," he said, waking up suddenly, "anything of the science of heraldry?"

"No," said Luke promptly.

"That's a very serious loss to you," replied the Canon; "what *did* you learn, or how did you employ your time?"

"To tell the truth, I'm beginning to think," said Luke, "that whatever I learned is so much useless lumber, and that I must get rid of it somehow and commence all over again."

"Very proper resolution," said the Canon. "Now, let me see!—Delmege! That must be a French or Norman name. Could your family have been Huguenots?"

"They were Palatines," said Luke. "They lived over there at Ballyorgan in the valleys, and became Catholics several generations back."

"How very interesting!" said the Canon. "Our family, as you are aware, are Scotch—Murray, Moray. It was one of my ancestors who held the painter of the boat for Mary Queen of Scots when she was escaping from that castle, you know; and it was the great queen who, extending her gloved hand to my—ha—ancestor, gave our family its motto. "Murray," she said, "'Murray, *sans tâche*.' I hope," continued the Canon, after a pause, "that I and my family will never bring a blot upon the fair escutcheon of our noble house."

Luke did not know exactly what to reply, but he was saved the trouble; for the Canon rose, and saying, in his most grandiose manner, "that he understood it was customary to demand—ha—a young priest's blessing," to Luke's consternation, the old man knelt humbly on the carpet. Luke repeated the words, but dared not, from old veneration, touch the white hair. And the Canon, rising, placed an envelope in his hands, and said:

"When you have said your three Masses, kindly say ten Masses for me! Goodby! I shall hope—ha—sometimes to hear of you from your excellent father. Goodby!"

The astonished and bewildered young priest opened the envelope when he had passed out of sight of the presbytery, and took out, with mingled feelings of surprise and gratitude, a note for five pounds.

"'Tis a queer world," said Luke. "I wonder when shall I understand it." If you value your peace of mind, Luke, let the mighty problem alone! It has vexed humanity from the beginning, and shall remain insoluble to the end. Find your work and do it. But who was ever content with this? Or what greatest sage was ever satisfied to look at the Sphinx of life without asking the meaning in her eternal eyes?

VII.—En Route.

The next few days passed pleasantly and cheerfully for Luke. The inestimable privilege of being able to say Mass in his father's house blessed and hallowed the entire day; and if occasionally he allowed himself to be tormented by the accidents and circumstances of life, or by grave questionings about men and their ways, all these vexatious troubles evaporated the moment he sat with his three clerical friends; and all jarring and dissonant sounds were merged and disappeared in the glorious dithyramb of friendship.

The three friends were known in the diocese as the "Inseparables." They formed a narrow and exclusive circle of themselves, and all candidates for admission were sternly blackballed. They dined together and supped together on all festive occasions. They took their summer holidays together at Lisdoonvarna; and there they insisted that their rooms should be on the same corridor and adjacent, and that their chairs should be placed together at the same table. At Kilkee, which is popularly supposed to be the hygienic supplement of Lisdoonvarna, just as the cold douche is supposed to wind up a Turkish bath, they bathed in the same pool or pollock hole, went together to Loop Head, or the Natural Bridges of Ross, fooled around during the hot day together; and if they ventured on a game of billiards after dinner, two played and the other marked. If any one else came in or interfered, the three walked away together. At home, they were equally exclusive.

Every Sunday evening, winter and summer, they met, to "celebrate the Eleusinian mysteries," said jealous outsiders, but in reality to dine; and the dinner on each occasion, and at each table, never varied—chickens and ham, followed by a tiny piece of roast mutton; one dish, generally of apples, as second course, and that was all. The only occasion when there was a shadow of a cloud between them was when Father Martin got a new housekeeper, and she treated her guests to what she was pleased to call a chancellor-pudding. The guests looked at it suspiciously, but declined to partake. Father Martin, always gentle and polite, made profuse apologies: "Give me the old horse for the long road," said Father Tim. So, too, the "Inseparables" held the same opinions on politics, the only difference being that Father Martin looked upon such things from a theoretical and academic standpoint, whereas Father Tim held himself passive, and Father Pat was disposed to be fiercely and relentlessly aggressive. Some said it was genuine, downright patriotism; some thought it was opposition to his pastor. No matter. There it was; and the great newspapers spoke of him as a "true soggarth, who was upholding, under difficult and trying circumstances, the noblest traditions of the Irish Church." These laudatory lines Father Pat had cut out, and pasted into the cover of the *Pars Aestiva* of his breviary, where they formed occasionally the subject of an *impromptu* meditation. And as these three excellent men were obliged to make their wills in conformity with the statutes of the diocese, it was understood (though this of course was a secret) that the two executors of him who should predecease the others were to be the survivors. What the last survivor was to do history does not tell.

And yet, with all the unbroken intimacy extending over many years, no three men could be more unlike in character, disposition, and education than the "Inseparables." Father Pat Casey was an open-air priest, who lived in the saddle, and was the familiar and intimate of every man, woman, and child in the parish. We might say, indeed, in the three parishes; for his brother clerics often good-humoredly complained that he forgot the rectification of the frontiers, and poached rather extensively on their preserves. He had a genuine, undisguised

horror of books. His modest library consisted of St. Liguori in two volumes, Perrone in four, Alzog in two, and Receveui in ten. There were, also, about fifty volumes of the Delphin classics, which had come down to him from a scholarly uncle; and in the midst of these was a single volume of De Quincy, with an account, amongst other essays, of the last days of Kant. This volume was the occasion of perpetual inquiry and interrogation.

"Where in the world did I pick it up? Who the mischief was this Kant? What a man for a Christian! Martin, I am sure I must have stolen it from you in a fit of abstraction."

But he would not part with it—not for its weight in gold. It had served him well a few times. It was always lying on the parlor table, except during meals, when it went back to the bookshelf; and once a high-born English lady, who had called to inquire about some poor people in the neighborhood, took it up, and said:

"I'm glad to see you interested in my favorite author, Father."

And once, when the bishop paid an *impromptu* visit, he found Father Pat deeply immersed in abstruse studies.

"Reading, Father Casey?" said the bishop, as if he were surprised.

"Yes, my Lord," said Father Pat, demurely.

The bishop took up the volume, turned over the leaves with a slight uplifting of the eyebrows, looked at Father Pat questioningly, looked at the book, and sighed.

There were a few prints of sacred subjects around the walls, one or two engravings signed Kaufmann, which Father Pat was told were of priceless value. But the masterpiece was over the mantel; it represented three or four horses, bay and black, their skins shining like mirrors. One was hurt, and a groom was chafing the fore foot. It was by one of the old masters, and it was called "Elliman's Embrocation."

"Take down that vulgar thing," said his parish priest, on one of the few occasions when he visited his curate. Father Pat obeyed, but put it back again. It was the source of innocent and ineffable pleasure to him.

Father Pat didn't preach. He only spoke to the people. Hence, after thirty years of zealous ministration, he remained a curate; and there seemed no likelihood that he would ever be asked, in his own words, "to change his condition."

Father Tim Hurley was pastor of a neighboring parish—a one-horse parish. He had no curate—a fact in which he took great pride when speaking to his fellow-pastors, but which he deplored, almost with tears in his eyes, when in the company of curates. Once, in his early days, he had had the supreme misfortune of making an excellent *bon mot*, and an unwise admirer had called him "Thou son of Sirach." From that day forward he assumed the aphoristic mode of speaking; and sometimes it was a torture to his friends to see him, in much agony, laboring to twist and extort from his inner consciousness some pithy phrase that would help him to conserve or extend his reputation. Under the unwise advice of his friend, Father Martin, he had laid in a stock of writers who had been remarkable for their wit and powers of repartee; but it was mighty hard to bring around Rochefoucauld in a conversation about the diocese, or Epictetus when they were talking about the harvest. And so Father Tim was driven, by the stress of circumstances, to fall back upon his own originality; and if, sometimes, he failed, he found, on the whole, that in his flights of fancy his own gray feathers were better than borrowed plumage.

Father Martin, again, was almost a direct antithesis to his friends; and as it was from him Luke's future life took chiefly its trend and bias, I must give him a little more space just here.

Father Martin Hughes was not originally intended for the Church, but for the Bar. For this purpose he had spent two years in Germany, passing from university to university, lodging in humble cottages by the banks of legendary rivers, or in the solitudes of black mountain forests; and here he had learned to prize the simple, cleanly lives, gray and drab in their monotony, but gilded by the music and the mystery that seems to hang like a golden cloud above the Fatherland. In after life he often recurred, with all the gratefulness of memory, to the kindliness and unaffected politeness of these simple peasants and woodcutters; and the little marks of sympathetic friendship, such as

the placing of a bunch of violets with silent courtesy on his dressing-table, or the little presents on his birthday, when his portrait was decorated by some child-gretchen, were graved indelibly on a memory almost too retentive. Then the pathos of the German hymns, sung by a whole family around the supper table, and to the accompaniment of a single table-piano, such as you see in every German household, haunted him like a dream; and when, by degrees, he began to realize that this country, which but a few years back had been cursed by a foreign tongue, had now, by a supreme magnificent effort, created its own language, and a literature unsurpassed for richness and sweetness, he saturated himself with the poetry and philosophy of the country, which gave a new color and embellishment to life. Not that he troubled himself much about the cloudy metaphysics of this school or that, or the fine hair-splitting of philosophical mountebanks who ridiculed the scholastics for logic-chopping, yet imitated in untruth the worst features of systems they condemned; but he allowed the fine mists and mountain dews of Herder, Richter, and Novalis to wrap him round and saturate his spirit, and thanked God that He had given poets to the world. The last months of his pilgrimage he had spent above the Necker, in the grand old town of Heidelberg, and he never saw it after but in such a sunset dream of coloring and such an overhanging heaven of azure as arches the golden landscapes on the canvases of Turner. But it was there and in the lonely recesses of the Hartz mountains, where village after village clustered around the church spire and the white tombs of the dead, that the gentle afflatus was breathed on him that turned his thoughts from the forum to the pulpit and from the world to God. But he never abandoned his German studies during all his after life. He had conceived the original and apparently extravagant idea of engrafting German ideas, German habits and manners on the peasantry at home, and he had written one thoughtful article on the affinity between German and Irish thought and tradition. He thought to show that German idealism and Celtic mysticism were the same, and that the issue of an alliance between the thoughts and sympathies of these nations

should necessarily be a healthy one. But he was hooted from the literary stage. France, and France alone, was to be our wetnurse and duenna—and Father Martin went back to his books and his dreams. He was, therefore, a cypher, a non-entity, for a silenced voice is supposed to denote and symbolize emptiness in a loud-tongued, blatant land. Then, again, his accomplishments and learning were merged and forgotten in the fact that he was the gentlest, the most imperturbable of men. And partly by native disposition, partly by habit and cultivation, he had come to that pass when he did not think it worth while to differ with any one about anything. He answered "Quite so!" to the most absurd and extravagant statement. Hence, after conferences and such like he was generally reputed dull, because he did not choose to take part in discussions, which had no interest for him. But there was a tradition amongst the "Inseparables" that after these occasions strange sounds of laughter used to be heard from the recesses of his library. But this was a mistake. It was only a musical box that used to play twelve airs, and which always required winding on these particular occasions. So said the "Inseparables" to the gentiles; but they had a Freemason secret amongst themselves that Father Martin did verily and indeed enjoy a joke. And in one of the secret recesses of his library, which no one was allowed to penetrate but the "Inseparables," he had a large ring or rosary of photographic portraits—Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Goethe, Wieland, Richter, Novalis, and Herder. The centre panel was for a long time vacant. Then one day it was filled—filled with a cabinet portrait of a man who, at his own dinner table, used to say by gestures, if not articulately to his worshippers and sycophants: "Behold, am I not your lord and master?" and they answered him and said: "Yea, verily, thou art our lord and king." And the horrible story went abroad that Father Martin, the demure monk and eremite, used to sit in his armchair for hours together, contemplating this circle of genius with the centre of conceited emptiness, and laugh loud and long at the dismal contrast.

Luke was privileged to spend his last three days in Ireland in the company of these kindly men. Why he was ad-

mitted within the magic circle was a great enigma to him, the only answer to which he found in his prospective exile. The profit he derived from this intercourse was probably not an appreciable quantity; but his nerves got smoothed out and calmed. It is true, indeed, that Father Tim gave labored utterance to one or two of his oracular sayings, which, not being quite consistent in their moral bearing with what Luke had been taught, occasioned him not a little anxiety and scruple. For example, Father Tim strongly inculcated on Luke the paramount necessity of "not selling himself cheap."

"The world takes you, me boy, at your own valuation. Hold your head high, and put a big price on yourself."

"But surely, Father," remonstrated Luke, "that would be quite inconsistent with Christian humility."

"Humility? God bless me, me boy, you'll be pulled and dragged through the mud; you'll be trampled into compost by the hoofs of men if you attempt to make little of yourself."

Luke was silent.

"An eel has a better chance than a salmon," said Father Tim, on another occasion, "of making his way in the narrow, and twisted, and shallow channels of Irish life." After a long pause of pleasure, he added: "But an eel is not a salmon for all that."

The brethren nodded assent.

"You have a good name to go to England with, me boy," he said, at his own dinner-table on Monday evening. "Who was the fool that said: 'What's in a name? A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.'"

"A great fellow called Will Shakspere," said Father Martin.

"I thought so. One of those cuckoos who hatches the eggs of others. Now, will any one tell me that Delmege—and if you can pronounce it in the French fashion so much the better—is not a wholesomer name for an exile than O'Shaughnessy or O'Deluchery? You'll find that this fellow will come back to us with an accent like a duchess, and that he'll find out that his ancestors fought at Poictiers, and that he is a first cousin, in the collateral line, to Joan of Arc."

"It is a curious form of insanity," said Father Martin, "and everyone is more or less affected."

"Except myself and Father Pat. I could never trace the Hurleys or the Caseys beyond the three-years-old and four-years-old factions. But I believe they were very conspicuous in these crusades." He added, in his tone of quiet sarcasm: "When I get a little money together, which is a rather problematical issue at present, I'm going to get my notepaper crested, like the Canon—two shillelaghs rampant—very rampant—on a background of red—very red, with the motto, *Nemo me impune lacessit*, or its Irish translation, *Don't tread on the tail of my coat;* and I'll also pay for Father Pat's, for he'll never have a penny to bless himself with."

"And wouldn't you kindly suggest an heraldic crest and motto for Father Pat?" said Father Martin.

"Certainly. A death's-head and crossbones couchant, on a black ground, with the motto of Napoleon: *Frappez-vite—frappez-fort*, or in the vernacular: *Wherever you see a head, hit it!*"

"No! no!" said Father Martin; "that would not be appropriate. Give him the surgeon's knife and the motto *Rescissa vegetius resurget.*"

To explain which parable we should add here that Father Pat was an amateur surgeon, principally in the veterinary department. He had a little surgery, a room about eight feet square, off the hall; and here he performed operations on animals that would have made Lister die of envy. Here he had put into splints the broken leg of a blackbird, who, in exchange for the gratuitous service, then and there abdicated his freedom, and became the melodious companion of the priest. Here, too, dogs of all shapes and breeds were brought to him, and whilst he treated them with infinite gentleness, and they licked his hand in gratitude, and the wistful, swimming look gathered into their eyes, as indeed into all eyes, human and other, in crises of their lives, some thought that he dropped a tear into the embrocation, and moistened the ointment in this old human way. In spiritual matters, too, he was an able and tender physician. I am not sure that he was a distinguished theologian, and that he could tell what Tom, Dick, and Harry thought on these important subjects, or that

he could weigh opinions in the balance, like that sensitive plate in the Bank of England, that flings good coins to the right, and light, spurious ones to the left, and quivers, as if in doubt, when a dubious coin is submitted, and reasons in its own mechanical way, and finally drops it. But Father Pat had a sovereign remedy, a pure anæsthetic, an antiseptic salve for all the wounds of humanity, and that was *Epikeia.* It was never known to fail him, and the consequence was that patients flocked to him from town and country and went away rejoicing.

"I can't make it out," he said. "I'm not much of a theologian, and the Lord knows I'm not a saint. I suppose 'tis the grace of God and an honest face."

"No matter," said Father Tim, in reply; "he'll never come to decent notepaper. Ah, me! if Pat had only held his head high, how different he would be to-day! Luke, me boy, hold your head high, and let every year increase your valuation."

"Tell him about Tracey," said Father Pat; "it might frighten him."

"About Tracey, that poor *angashore* in the city? Well, he's an awful example. He had a good parish—as good a parish as there is in the diocese. It is my own native parish—"

"It is the Siberia of the diocese," hinted Father Martin.

"It's my own native parish," said Father Tim, "and though I shouldn't say it, there's as good a living there—well, no matter. What did our friend Tracey do? Instead of thanking God and his bishop, he flew into the face of God, he insulted the bishop, he insulted the people, and he insulted me." The memory of the insult was so vivid and painful that Father Tim could not speak for several seconds.

"He began to make meditations, if you please, with the result, of course, that he went clean off his head. His delusion was that he was too elevated as a parish priest, God bless the mark! and that his salvation would be more secure on a lower rung of the ladder. He resigned his parish and became chaplain to a city hospital. He is low enough now. He may be

seen wandering around the streets of the city with a coat on him as green as a leek, and he looks like an anatomy. Of course he is off his head; and the fun is, he likes to be told it. And if you'd politely hint that he has been, and must have been, suspended for an occult crime, he'd shake your hand like a hungry friend whom you had unexpectedly asked to dinner."

"By Jove!" said Luke, forgetting himself, and striking the table, "the first vacation I get, I'll make a pilgrimage to the city and kiss that man's feet."

"That's easy enough," said Father Tim, "because his shoes are usually well ventilated, and he's not shy about showing his trotters. Meanwhile, Luke, spare these few glasses of mine. They are all I have, and this is a hungry parish."

"Tell me, Father Martin," said Luke, as the two went home together, "is that true what Father Tim told about that priest in Limerick? Because one never knows when he is serious and when jesting."

"Literally true," said Father Martin, with that tone of seriousness which was natural to him, and which he only suppressed in moments of relaxation.

"And are cases like this very rare?" asked Luke.

"Not so rare as you may imagine," replied Father Martin, "but not so remarkable."

"I suppose the man is worshipped," said Luke, gauging the popular estimate by his own.

"Quite the contrary. He is regarded by all as an imbecile. The people only think of him as one 'tetched in his mind.'"

"But the brethren—his own—who understand his heroism?"

"Oh!" said Father Martin with a long breath. "Well," he said deliberately, "here, too, there is compassion, but no great admiration. He is not called a fool, but he is treated as such. I remember a few months ago a magnificent sermon, preached by a great pulpit orator, on 'Humility.' It was really beautiful, and the picture he drew of St. Francis, hooted by the people of his native town, and called 'a fool,' was photographic in its perfect details. But when he met Father Tracey, with his old green coat at the dinner table afterwards, it was delightful to see

his condescension. He shook hands with him, apparently with some reluctance, but said immediately after to one of a group of his admirers: 'Poor fellow! poor fellow!' But the cream of the joke was that an excellent man, immediately after, spoke of the distinguished orator as the exact and happy antithesis of wretched failures like Father Tracey."

"It's a dreadful enigma," said Luke, wearily mopping his forehead. "I don't know where I am."

"You see Father Tim's advice was not so far absurd as you seem to think. We are all like frogs in a swamp, each trying to croak louder than his fellows, and to lift his stupid head somewhat above them out of this dreary Slough of Despond. And for what, think you? That he might have a better opportunity than his fellows to see the fens and quagmires of this dreary existence, and inhale the more deeply the marsh-miasms of this fever-stricken and pestilential planet."

"But, surely, you do not agree with what Father Tim said?" said Luke, in an accent of despair.

"I fully agree with his conclusion that, if you are humble and lowly and self-effaced, you will certainly be crushed into compost under the hoofs of wild asses. But—" He stopped, and Luke watched him.

"I believe, also, that the highest Christian teaching is true; and that no real work is done in the world except by humble and lowly men. Did you notice the two photos on my mantelpiece?"

"Yes; your idols?"

"According to mood. When I am disposed to be contemptuous or scornful or too zealous, I turn to Savonarola; he was my deity for half my life. When I am in a gentle and charitable mood, I light a taper before the Curé of Ars."

"'Tis all a mighty puzzle," said Luke.

"Ay, 'tis a mad world, my merry masters," answered the priest. Then, after a long pause, he said:

"I dare say you're pretty tired of the advice and wisdom of your seniors. But you have had a great misfortune. You have come into the world worse equipped than if you had been born blind or lame. You have a hundred naked, quivering

nerves, wide open on every square inch of your body. Happy you if you had been born with the hide of a rhinoceros. As this is not so, I say to you first, with the Grecian philosopher:

"*Habita tecum.* Dwell as much as you can with your own thoughts. Secondly:

"Make God your companion, not men. Thirdly:

"Feed not on ephemeral literature, but on the marrow of giants. Good-by! till to-morrow."

On Friday afternoon, Luke was launched on the high seas in the London steamer, and into the mighty world at the same time. The enigma of life was going to be shown him for solution on larger canvas and in deeper colors in the strange and unfamiliar environments of English life.

[To be continued.]

THE PRIEST AT THE SICK-BED.

Signs of Probable Danger of Death by Sickness.

"*Infirmatur* quis in vobis? inducat Presbyteros Ecclesiae et orent super eum, *unguentes* eum *Oleo* in nomine Domini."—Jacob. 5: 14.

THE purport of this article is to throw out such practical hints, concerning the visitation of the sick, as may be serviceable to the newly-ordained priest about to enter upon mission work in the hospital of the world. Emanating from one whose work, for several years part, in perhaps the largest infirmary of its kind in the United Kingdom, has brought him daily into contact with almost every form of disease, the remarks embodied herein may be found helpful in determining when there is probable danger of death by sickness.

The young apostle emerging from his hidden life in the seminary—his mind stored with theological knowledge; rejoicing in the power of sacerdotal grace; fortified with the unction of his consecration and filled with zeal and fervor—goes forth like his Divine Master, nineteen centuries ago, into the reeking hospital of misery and pestilence.

It has been said with truth that the visitation of the sick is the touchstone of apostolic zeal and charity. But whatever be the fervor and charity of the young priest; whatever his theological attainments, he will often, at the outset, when summoned to attend the sick, find himself in a quandary. His very earnestness may oftentimes occasion much needless anxiety and lead to his anointing an invalid when *de facto* there is no probable danger of death at all. In cases where there is no nurse at hand he can consult, or when, again, the visits of the doctor are few and his time of calling uncertain, a priest is left entirely to use his own discretion. Not infrequently, therefore, "in dubio standum est pro aegroto" is the only principle that comforts him in his dilemma. Furthermore, a priest is always exposed to fraud. I remember some years ago being called out, on a dark wet night, to a girl in one of the courts of the district. I found, on my arrival, the father and mother moaning and crying beside the bed on which their sick daughter lay. But a superficial examination satisfied me she was in no danger of death at all. It was merely a begging case.

Again, it is well known that the doctor's principle is never to abandon hope. Hence he may often raise delusive hopes in a parent and mislead an inexperienced priest. To quote a case in point: I was once summoned to attend a young man evidently in a dying condition; yet though the death-dew was upon his brow, the doctor said he hoped to pull him through. I administered the last Sacraments and the patient died a few hours later.

It is to be regretted, I think, that the acquirement of a knowledge of, at least, the elementary principles of medicine is not included in the curriculum of ecclesiastical studies in our seminaries. A few lectures delivered by a physician, say in the last year of a student's course, might be feasible, and certainly would be invaluable. I know a priest is not expected, nor is it advisable for him, to enter too deeply into medical science; nevertheless, there is much that it is well for him to be acquainted with. I would say, in the first place, that every mission-priest should know how to take a person's pulse, should know something of respiration and temperature.

For the benefit, therefore, of the uninitiated, I may point out that the *pulse* is ascertained by placing the three middle fingers on the radial artery at the wrist near the ball of the thumb. As to the pulse, it may be said that in health the pulse beats about 120 per minute in infants, 80 in children, from 60 to 70 in maturity, and 50 in old age, and should be rhythmical. While an irregular pulse is a sign of exhaustion, a full, bounding pulse is an indication of fever.

With regard to *respirations*, it should be noted that they should be 50 per minute in infants, 36 in children, and about 20 in adults. Like pulse-beats, they may be irregular. And under this head I would direct attention to what, perhaps, few priests have witnessed—"Cheyne-Stokes respiration," as it is called. This may be best described as rapid breathing, becoming gradually slower until there is temporary cessation—a cessation lasting, in some cases, from ten seconds to nearly a minute. Where this is found it is practically a fatal sign, and the sick man should be anointed forthwith. There is also another kind of breathing—well to mention—occurring in later stages of diabetes, known as "air-hunger," evidenced by the deep-drawn sigh. Here we have another fatal omen, and, when recognized, the patient should be, likewise, immediately anointed.

A word now upon *temperature*. One may take it as a guiding principle, that in health the temperature of a person is 98.4° Fahr. It rises slightly during night-time and falls in the early hours of morning. A temperature of 100° is indicative of fever. A temperature of 104° may be regarded as serious, and when it attains 106° very hopeless if maintained. Conversely, in times of collapse, it may descend to 96°, or lower still. From what has been stated, therefore, a priest will act wisely in anointing any parishioner whose temperature has risen to 105°. I lay this down merely as a *general* rule.

We will now proceed to comment upon such diseases as are commonly met with by a priest in the carrying out of his ministerial duties in the hives of our large cities. And here it is only fair to state that it is impossible for me to deal, within the narrow compass of this short paper, with all the diseases that may be

brought under his notice. I shall limit my observations to some of the most common.

PNEUMONIA.—The symptoms or signs of pneumonia may be put down in general thus: rust-colored sputa, rapid pulse, and, consequently, high temperature, with danger of delirium, and respiration increased in a more marked extent than is pulse. It may supervene on *influenza*, and is of more serious import in *alcoholic* subjects. Any sufferer from pneumonia over fifty years of age, or who has a pulse over 140 beats per minute, or betrays indications of cyanosis,—that is, blue lips, blue cheeks, and blue finger-tips, or again is discovered to have cold extremities,—should be anointed without any hesitation.

TYPHOID.—The next disease I would speak of is typhoid. Typhoid or enteric fever is a disease which claims our earnest attention by reason of its grave character, since mortality in this instance may be stated as one in ten. This serious fact of itself leads me to remark that where there is no trained nurse, as is frequently the case in large missions, it is always prudent to anoint the sufferer. This disease has often a duration of thirty days, death more commonly occurring during the third or fourth week. Whenever, then, the temperature of the sick person is 105°, a priest has always good reasons for anointing; but certainly when there is found to be hemorrhage from the bowels, one should not fail to anoint *hic et nunc*. And here I may be permitted to digress for a moment, in order to suggest that, in regard to typhoid cases, it is advisable for a priest to administer the Holy Viaticum after having moistened the Sacred Particle, or to give water to the sick person immediately he has received It, owing to the parched state of a typhoid's tongue.

CARDIAC DISEASE.—Passing next to the consideration of heart-disease, or "cardiac," as it is termed, I will begin by attending to a common fallacy, that those who suffer from this disease are in serious danger of dying suddenly. As a matter of fact, experience testifies that few cardiac subjects die suddenly (I except the case of "angina pectoris"). Death

ensues in rare cases *suddenly*, but is generally *gradual*. Yet there are almost infallible signs of proximate danger, which all priests should know of. I mean irregular pulse, cyanosis, cold extremities, œdema or swelling of feet and legs, cough and irregular respiration. And I may point out that *pericarditis*,—that is, inflammation of the membrane of the heart,—is of common occurrence in rheumatic fever. When, therefore, such signs are in evidence, the invalid should be promptly anointed.

PHTHISIS.—Let us now go on to treat of a disease which is very prevalent in large towns, namely, phthisis or consumption, the subjects of which disorders can be easily detected by their wan and wasted appearance and constant spitting of phlegm or sputum. In many advanced stages, appear cold sweats and hæmoptysis or blood-spitting, and whenever this latter begins to occur, a priest may be sure there is imminent danger, and should anoint the patient *at once;* because, after hæmoptysis has begun, the sick man may have a severe attack at any moment, and die without warning. And now just a word by the way. It sometimes happens that, because a man spits a good deal, as all consumptive patients do, a priest is filled with apprehensions lest if Holy Viaticum be administered, he may spit It up again. For the sake of those just ushered into the sphere of mission-work, I would remark that sputum comes not from the stomach, but from the lungs.

HICCUP.—After this observation, I would draw the reader's attention to the fact that hiccup, so little thought of in young folks, is frequently a fatal omen when it occurs in old people, and when this is noticed, it is wise to anoint.

I will now make a few observations on *kidney-disease*, *bronchitis*, and *delirium tremens*, and I have done.

KIDNEY-DISEASE.—Among the signs of this disease in its last stage may be enumerated swelling of the feet and legs (often pericarditis), pallor of face, coma, and vomiting and fits; when, therefore, this disease reveals indications above stated, the patient should not fail to be anointed.

BRONCHITIS.—Perhaps the affliction or disease known as

bronchitis is brought under a priest's notice more frequently than any other. And in speaking of this, I would say that there is a dangerous form of *chronic bronchitis* occurring in old people, especially in cases of valvular disease of the heart, accompanied with feverish temperature and copious expectoration. Those laboring under these conditions should be anointed. But there is another form of this disease called *acute bronchitis*, the signs of which are fever, quick respiration, expectoration of frothy sputum, and at times a complication of heart-mischief. A priest, here likewise, should anoint.

DELIRIUM TREMENS.—Now to our next and last disease, *delirium tremens*. Proh dolor! would that it were less common! One beholds in it the sequel and penalty of the vice of intemperance. The victim of this affliction is easily discoverable by his loss of sleep, hallucinations, often imagining rats round about him and blue devils, and by the tremulous motion of his hands, and general excited and frequently violent manner. Not seldom is this disease accompanied by pneumonia (induced by lying in damp places), and when a priest finds this to be so, he should at once anoint.

To sum up. As a rule a priest should anoint when—

In adults pulse is abnormally feeble and very irregular, or again, when pulse is over 140—excessively rapid;

if respiration is very irregular;

in all cases of "Cheyne-Stokes" respiration and diabetes breathing;

in cases where temperature is 105°, or very low (94°);

when the patient suffering from pneumonia is over fifty years of age, or has pulse over 140, and cyanosis is conspicuous, and there is marked coldness of extremities;

as a rule, on the district, when a typhoid subject shows temperature 105°, and has hemorrhage;

in all heart-cases where there is evidence of cyanosis, cough, œdema, and faulty respiration;

in consumptive cases where there is hæmoptysis;

in old people when hiccup is marked;
in kidney-disease when there is coma (unconsciousness) or excessive vomiting or convulsions;
in bronchitis when chronic and the sufferer is aged and has high temperature and cyanosis; in all cases when *acute* and the patient shows signs of heart failure, with cyanosis;
in a case of *delirium tremens* when pneumonia is present.

In bringing these observations to a close I must crave the indulgence of the perusers of these pages, the subject-matter of which, I am fully conscious, has been dealt with in so cramped and fragmentary a fashion. I venture, nevertheless, to express the hope that the advice it contains may be found to be of practical utility, at least to the neophyte leaving his *alma mater*, full of apostolic zeal, patience, and charity, to perpetuate amid pestilence, disease and misery the noble work of his Great Exemplar, who walked among men, meriting, by word and by deed, the sublime and endearing name of "The Good Samaritan."

ALFRED MANNING MULLIGAN.

Birmingham, England.

A CATHOLIC NORMAL SCHOOL FOR HIGH-SCHOOL TEACHERS.

A LETTER from Cardinal Vaughan on the "Intellectual Needs of Catholic Women in England," which was printed and circulated among the convent schools in August, 1897, warned all teachers, religious and secular, that the English nation was urgently pressing for legislation on the subject of secondary education. "The Catholic Church in England," His Eminence said, "will have nothing to fear in the coming struggle if her Orders and Congregations, dedicated to the work of education, are faithful to their high mission. But in order to compete with the educational powers of the non-Catholic world, they will have to submit to the common test—a public examination to gain a diploma of recognized value."

Hitherto there had been no centre where Catholics could follow the higher course of study necessary for this; and Protestant training colleges were closed to religious, even had they been disposed to enter them. The English Hierarchy, therefore, expressed a wish to establish a Catholic Training College for the scientific preparation of women teachers in Catholic schools. Accordingly, the Superiors of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus, to whom the Cardinal entrusted the work, prepared several of their Sisters to pass the requisite examinations, and a diploma was granted them by the Syndicate of the Cambridge University. A small class was then opened at the Convent, Cavendish Square, London, to work for a time under the supervision of Sir Joshua Fitch, one of Her Majesty's inspectors of training colleges. The result of the first year's work was so successful that the University formally recognized the Convent as a training college, under the same conditions and to enjoy the same privileges as any other college in the country. This public recognition has put the seal to the work, and the testimony borne to its excellence by inspectors and visitors—the majority of whom are non-Catholics—is most encouraging and gratifying.

The programme of studies carried out is that prescribed by the University, except in the matter of Catholic philosophy. Two diplomas are conferred—one for theoretical work, the other for practical teaching. The theoretical is tested by a written examination in the following subjects: Art of Teaching, Psychology, Logic, History of Education, School Hygiene, Methods, School Organization, etc. The practical diploma is granted only to students who have attended, for one year at least, an authorized training college, and there learnt to put their theories into practice. A lesson given before an inspector and the report of the student's criticism lessons during the year decide the grade of this diploma, whether first, second, or only third class.

Perhaps some account of the work will be more interesting than a mere list of subjects and books studied, especially to those who cannot visit the College to see its practical working for themselves.

The most important lecture is the Psychology, which for the first two terms is given on the lines of Catholic philosophy, in order to safeguard the students against the errors of such modern writers as Sully, Bain, and Croom Robertson, whose books are prescribed by the University for the final test examination. However, in time, as Catholic students become more numerous, it is hoped they will be allowed an alternative syllabus in this subject. But meanwhile, the extra work of laying a Catholic foundation, so far from hindering, has given a broader view to the mind, and the students from the Catholic College have been told more than once that their papers show a greater insight into the subject than those of their Protestant neighbors.

The Art-of-Teaching lectures are held once a week; and, as the name implies, deal with such subjects as class discipline, kinds of skill required in teaching, notes of lessons, criticism lessons, etc. In the second term of the year, the question of School Organization is studied, and more advanced problems are discussed as the students gain experience or meet with new difficulties in their school work.

School Hygiene and its practical application to children's health is one of the most valuable lectures, and for this reason extern teachers not otherwise doing the College work have been glad to follow this course.

Technical work and the criticism of lessons are very essential items in the training syllabus. The former consists of practice on the blackboard, of illustrations suitable for lessons, followed by some oral teaching exercise, such as telling a story to a class, or impressing some salient point of a lesson in a new way. Generally, these exercises are intended as a test of readiness and resourcefulness, and they are criticized most vigorously by the Mistress of Method and by all the students in turn, so that much friendly help is given to the beginner or the diffident. The variety and difficulty of the exercises give great zest to the work, and the readiness of illustration and fluency of speech thus acquired are of great value to the teacher.

Voice-production and Elocution, Methods of teaching the various school subjects, and an elementary course of Logic and

Ethics complete the curriculum in the way of lectures. Two or three afternoons a week are devoted to giving lessons under criticism in practising schools of various grades. For these, more or less elaborate "notes" have been prepared beforehand; but they are not used in class, the teachers striving to be, as Pestalozzi declared a good teacher must be, "independent of any extraneous aid except his blackboard and chalk."

The students at the College have been for the most part Nuns of various teaching Orders, and each and all have expressed themselves perfectly satisfied with the arrangements made for their accommodation. The Sisters follow all the lectures in company with the secular students; but if they prefer to do so, they may study in their own rooms instead of in the common library; and their meals are all taken apart from the other students. They are afforded every opportunity of fulfilling their own particular religious duties, so that as far as possible each can carry out her own rule. Already the Franciscans, Servites, Dominicans, Daughters of Christian Education, Sisters of the Holy Family, of the Retreat of the Sacred Heart, and of the Holy Child Jesus, have been numbered on the College roll, so that many of the leading convent high schools in England have now a certificated mistress on their staff.

The secular students, of course, fraternize together out of college hours, and during worktime the example of and constant intercourse with their religious fellow-students have been found to have a most salutary effect upon them.

The appreciation of the advantages and means of progress offered by the London Training College is on the increase; and it is hoped that in the near future a still greater advance may be made in a work upon the success of which depends the intellectual and moral education of the rising generation of English Catholics.

M. S. R.

Analecta.

EX ACTIS LEONIS XIII.

Contra Abusum Differendi Baptismi Administrationem. Ad Episcop. Anglonen. et Tursien.

Venerabilis Frater, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

Gratae vehementer, Dilecte Fili Noster, tuae Litterae titulo *Mali e Rimedii* ad istum Clerum et Populum elapso mense Martio datae, Nobis fuerunt, quibus pastorali sollicitudine paternoque affectu inveteratum lamentaris abusum S. Baptismatis in hebdomadas, in menses imo et in annos pueris differendi, atque ad eum ab ista Tibi concredita Dioecesi exterminandum totus incumbis. Nil sane hac mala consuetudine iniquius, nil ecclesiasticis sanctionibus magis contrarium: utpote quae non solum tot animarum aeternam salutem, inexcusabili temeritate, in manifestum periculum infert; sed eas insuper, intra id temporis, certo fraudat ineffabilibus gratiae sanctificantis charismatibus quae per regenerationis lavacrum infunduntur; resque aliquoties eousque deducere potest ut, quod proprio tempore omissum fuit, nunquam amplius in posterum sit faciendum. Dum igitur Tibi, Dilecte Fili Noster, ut incoeptum opus strenue perficias ultro vires addimus; non possumus quin tam detestabilem usum, in Deum simul impium ac in homines, ubicumque infeliciter invaluerit, ex animo improbemus et exsecremur.

Atque ut, Deo adiuvante, prospere Tibi res cedant, Tibimet, Dilecte Fili Noster, Tibique subdito Gregi Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die XIII mensis Augusti MDCCCXCIX, Pontificatus Nostri anno vicesimo secundo.

LEO PP. XIII.

E S. R. UNIV. INQUISITIONE.

I.

ORDINARII NEQUEUNT DISPENSARE IN ART. MORTIS AB IMPEDIM. MATR. ILLOS QUI CIVILI MATR. NON SUNT CONIUNCTI, NEQUE IN CONCUBINATU AMPLIUS VIVUNT.

Beatissime Pater:

Vicarius Capitularis Dioecesis N. N. ad pedes S. V. provolutus quae sequuntur exponit.

Decreto S. R. et U. Inquisitionis diei 20 Februarii 1888, Sanctitas Vestra benigne annuit pro gratia, qua locorum Ordinarii dispensare valeant sive per se, sive per ecclesiasticam personam sibi benevisam, super impedimentis publicis matrimonium dirimentibus, cum iis qui in gravissimo mortis periculo constituti, et quando non suppetit tempus recurrendi ad Sanctam Sedem, iuxta leges civiles sunt coniuncti, aut alias in concubinatu vivunt, ut morituri in tanta temporis angustia in faciem Ecclesiae rite copulari et propriae conscientiae consulere valeant.

Nunc vero in hac civitate N. N. nonnulli concubinarie viventes prolem genuerunt, et postea, relicto contubernio, iam iam graviter aegrotantes, cum eadem persona, cum qua in concubinatu vixerunt, ad prolem legitimandam, vel mulieris famam aut damnum reparandum, vel ad scandalum tollendum, vel ad propriae conscientiae consulendum, matrimonium contrahere desiderant.

Hisce praehabitis, suprascriptus Vicarius Capitularis Sanctitati Vestrae dubia, quae sequuntur enodanda proponit:

I. Utrum sub citato decreto S. R. et U. Inquisitionis diei 20 Februarii 1888 etiam comprehendi valeant aegroti in mortis periculo constituti, qui actualiter non vivunt in concubinatu, sed tamen in eo vixerunt, prolemque genuerunt quam legitimare oportet?

II. Utrum comprehendi etiam valeant aegroti, qui actualiter non vivunt, sed tamen vixerunt in nefario concubinatu, quin prolem genuerint, vel genita iam obierit?

Feria IV, die 3 Maii 1899.

In Congregatione Generali Sacrae Romanae et Universalis Inquisitionis, propositis suprascriptis dubiis, rite perpensis omnibus tum iuris tum facti rationum momentis praehabitoque RR. DD. Consultorum voto, Emi ac Rmi DD. in rebus fidei et morum Generales Inquisitores respondendum censuerunt:

Detur Decretum fer. IV, diei 17 Septembris 1890 latum super dubio proposito ab Archiep. Compostellan.

Porro huiusmodi dubium ita se habebat: "Utrum vi decre-"torum diei 20 Februarii 1888 et 1 Martii 1889 valeant Ordinarii "per se vel per parochos dispensare super impedimentis . . . "in articulo mortis constitutos, licet matrimonium civile quod "vocant non celebraverint, nec vivant in concubinatu?—Emi "PP. respondendum mandarunt: *Negative.*"

Feria vero VI, die 5 eiusdem mensis Maii SSmus D. N. Leo div. prov. PP. XIII in audientia R. P. D. Adsessori S. O. impertita, habita hac de re relatione, resolutionem Emorum PP. adprobavit et confirmavit.

I. *Can.* MANCINI, *S. R. et U. Inquisit. Notarius.*

II.

(DUBIUM.)

DE HOSTIIS EX FARINA DE CUJUS GENUINITATE NON CONSTAT.

Episcopus N. N. S. Sedi, ut sequitur, exponit:

In hac mea dioecesi N. et in circumvicinis Dioecesibus venumdantur a pluribus annis in magna quantitate, farinae haud genuinae, quae saepe fuerunt adhibitae etiam in efformandis hostiis pro S. Missa.

Plures sacerdotes in bona vel in dubia fide circa validitatem materiae, celebrarunt divinum Sacrificium cum hostiis ex hac farina confectis.

In peragenda S. Pastorali Visitatione, quum gravitatem negotii perspicerem, totus fui in applicandis energicis remediis, providendo in singulis locis, sub severis sanctionibus; quae

provisiones et sanctiones confirmatae fuerunt, et dein ad totam Dioecesim extensae per specialem litteram.

Ex illis dispositionibus turbata fuit *quoad praeteritum* conscientia nonnullorum sacerdotum, qui a me postulant quomodo sese gerere debeant relate ad missas iam celebratas cum supradicta materia, et aliquando cum dubio circa validitatem.

Quapropter E. V. Rmam precor ut dignetur obtinere a S. Sede Aplica benignam sanationem in favorem praedictorum meorum sacerdotum (etiam pro missis extra dioecesim celebratis) et illa concessa, obtinere etiam ut possint ab omni gravamine conscientiae immunes fieri, recitando exiguum numerum missarum, qui iuxta mitissimam proportionem determinari possit, ab Ordinario in singulis casibus.

RESPONSUM.

Et S. Congr. Suprema S. Officii, mature perpenso hoc quaesito, in fer. IV die 27 Ianuarii 1897 audito voto Consultorum rescripsit: *Supplicandum Sanctissimo ut suppleat de Thesauro Ecclesiae, quatenus opus sit, habita ratione circa missas celebrandas eorum qui in bona et eorum qui in dubia fide celebrarunt.* Sequenti vero fer. VI, 29 eiusdem mensis, facta relatione SS. D. N. Leoni PP. XIII, SSmus. *resolutionem Emorum Patrum confirmavit, et petitam gratiam benigne concessit.*

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

DUBIA DE CONFRATERNITATIBUS A SSMO ROSARIO NUNCUPATIS.

Episcopus Augustanus plura dubia huic S. Congni Indulgentiarum dirimenda proposuit, quae, post Constitutionem *Ubi primum* de Confraternitatibus a SS. Rosario nuncupatis nuper editam iussu SS.mi D.ni Nostri Leonis Papae XIII, ipsi oborta sunt. His et alia superaddidit quae ex nonnullis Decretis huius S. C. repetenda videntur, eo quod quaestio movetur an, et quomodo illa Confraternitatibus SS.mi Rosarii sint applicanda.

Dubia vero proposita sunt sequentia:

I. In dioecesi Augustensi iampridem existunt fere in omnibus ecclesiis parochialibus Confraternitates SS. Rosarii, quin

tamen habeantur litterae patentes Magistri Generalis Ordinis Praedicatorum, in plerisque locis deperditae. Quamobrem orator petit, utrum ad canonicam Confraternitatis existentiam sufficiat per aliquod documentum, puta, per processum verbalem ipsius erectionis, vel inscriptionem commemorativam in Regesto sodalium Confraternitatis, aliudve huiusmodi in documento authentico asservatum, certam haberi notitiam quod litterae Magistri Generalis pro tali ecclesia iam concessae fuerint, an vero novae requirantur litterae patentes ipsius Magistri Generalis?

II. An per Decretum S. C. Indulgentiarum d. d. 20 Maii 1896 in una *Ordinis Praedicatorum* ad II.^{um} abrogata censeatur lex a S. C. Indulgentiarum die 8 Ianuarii 1861 sancita (in formula servanda in substantialibus pro erectione Confraternitatum) sub n. V. hisce verbis expressa: "quod gratiae et "indulgentiae confraternitati communicatae, praevia cognitione "Ordinarii dumtaxat promulgentur?"

Et quatenus negative:

III. An cognitio Ordinarii exprimi debeat in scriptis ad calcem Summarii Indulgentiarum?

IV. An piae Uniones *Rosarii Viventis*, a Magistro Generali Ordinis Praedicatorum institutae, subiaceant praescriptionibus Clementinae *Quaecumque*, sicut et Confraternitates SS. Rosarii, ad tramitem decreti S. C. Indulgentiarum d. d. 25 Augusti 1897 in una *Urbis et Orbis* ad I.^{um}?

V. An Episcopus tolerare possit sive Confraternitates proprie dictas, sive pias Uniones sub SS. Rosarii titulo, absque interventu Magistri Generalis Ordinis Praedicatorum a parochis, vel aliis sacerdotibus institutas, etiam cum conditione vel praetextu, quod huiusmodi Confraternitates vel piae Uniones non gaudent privilegiis et indulgentiis Confraternitatum SS. Rosarii?

VI. An, non obstante Decreto S. C. Indulgentiarum d. d. 25 Augusti 1897 in una *Urbis et Orbis* vi specialis privilegii Rectores Confraternitatum SS. Rosarii albo suae Confraternitatis permittere valeant inscribi nomina defunctorum, etiam ad hunc finem dumtaxat, ut defuncti fiant participes meritorum Confraternitatis, et precibus sodalium commendati habeantur?

VII. An Decreta S. C. Indulgentiarum d. d. 12 Decembris 1892, in una *Coloniensi* et 15 Novembris 1893 in una pariter

Coloniensi, pro sodalitate S. Scapularis, applicari possint Confraternitati SS. Rosarii, ita ut confratres SS. Rosarii recepti vel inscripti a sacerdotibus facultatem habentibus, omnes Indulgentias Confraternitatis lucrentur vi ipsius legitimae receptionis, etiamsi eorum nomina cum nominibus aliorum sodalium in albo Confraternitatis non sint adhuc materialiter inscripta?

VIII. An, stante privilegio Confraternitatis SS. Rosarii, quo gratia concessa a S. Sede non censetur revocata, nisi fiat de ea specialis mentio, sacerdotes, utentes formula ab Innocentio XI praescripta pro Indulgentia a confratribus SS. Rosarii in articulo mortis lucranda, valide agant, an vero debeant uti formula data in Constitutione Benedicti XIV *Pia Mater?*

IX. An formula pro Indulgentia acquirenda a confratribus in articulo mortis recitari valeat dumtaxat a Rectoribus Confraternitatum et sacerdotibus per Magistrum Generalem Ordinis Praedicatorum delegatis, an vero, quoad confratres SS. Rosarii, a quocumque sacerdote, etiam extra confessionem?

X. An Confraternitates SS. Rosarii erectae a Legatis Apostolicis, Nuntiis, ceterisque Praesulibus vi specialis facultatis apostolicae, indigeant nova erectione per Magistrum Generalem Ordinis Praedicatorum?

Et E.mi ac R.mi Patres in Congregatione Generali habita ad Vaticanum rescripserunt die 3 Augusti 1899:

Ad I^{um} Affirmative ad 1^{am} partem; Negative ad 2^{am}.

Ad II^{um} Negative. Ad III^{um} Non est necesse.

Ad IV^{um} Negative. Ad V^{um} Reformato dubio uti sequitur:

An per Apostolicas Litteras *Ubi primum* datas a SS. D. N. Leone PP. XIII die 2 Octobris 1898, Episcopis aliisque gaudentibus facultate in genere erigendi Confraternitates, revocata fuerit facultas erigendi Confraternitates vel Pias Uniones sub titulo SS. Rosarii absque interventu Magistri Generalis Ordinis Praedicatorum?

Respondendum: Supplicandum SS.mo, ut dignetur mentem suam pandere.

Ad VI^{um} Negative, facto verbo cum SS.mo.

Ad VII^{um} Affirmative.

Ad VIII^{um} Reformato dubio uti infra:

An pro impertienda plenaria Indulgentia in articulo mortis confratribus SS.mi Rosarii, adhibenda sit formula ab Innocentio

XI adprobata, an vero formula a Benedicto XIV praescripta in Constitutione *Pia Mater?*

Respondendum: Negative ad 1am partem; Affirmative ad 2am.

Ad IXum. Reformato dubio hoc modo:

An benedictio in articulo mortis cum adnexa plenaria Indulgentia confratribus SS.mi Rosarii impertienda sit a sacerdotibus per Magistrum Generalem Ordinis Praedicatorum delegatis, an vero a quocumque sacerdote, etiam extra confessionem?

Rescribendum: Negative ad 1am partem; Affirmative ad 2am.

Ad Xum Non propositum.

Factaque de iis omnibus per me infrascriptum Cardinalem Praefectum relatione SS.mo D.no Nostro Leoni Papae XIII, in audientia habita die 10 Augusti 1899, SS.mus omnes resolutiones Emorum Patrum benigne adprobavit, mentemque suam quoad Vum dubium pandere dignatus est expresse edicens: "Revocavimus, et ut revocatas haberi volumus facultates quibuscumque concessas erigendi Confraternitates piasque Uniones sub titulo SS.mi Rosarii sine litteris patentibus Magistri Generalis Ordinis Praedicatorum; ita ut si quae in posterum erigantur sive Confraternitates sive piae Uniones sub titulo SS.mi Rosarii absque praefatis litteris, nullis gaudiant beneficiis, privilegiis, indulgentiis quibus Romani Pontifices legitimam verique nominis Sodalitatem a SS. Rosario auxerunt; quin imo nec gaudeant aliis Indulgentiis, quae communiter conceduntur omnibus sub quovis titulo Confraternitatibus canonice erectis. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque."

Datum Romae ex Secretaria S. Congregationis Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae die 10 Augusti 1899.

Fr. Hieronymus M. *Card.* Gotti, *Praef.*

L. ✝ S. A. Sabatucci *Archiep.* Antinoen., *Secr.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE SUPER NEG. ECCL. EXTRAORDINARIIS.

Archiepis Americae Latinae datur privilegium concedendi 80 dies Indulgentiae.

Die 4 Iulii 1899.

Cum relatum fuerit SSmo Dno antiquam in Americae latinae regionibus generatim vigere consuetudinem, de qua tamen nul-

lum extat scriptum documentum, ut nempe Archiepiscopi, loco quadraginta dierum sicuti de iure, octoginta Indulgentiae dies concedant: cumque eidem SSmo Domino ab Archiepiscopis Concilio Plenario Americano in Urbe adstantibus supplicatum fuerit ut consuetudinem illam ratihabere ac confirmare dignaretur; Sanctitas Sua certam ac uniformem in America latina disciplinam statuere Ecclesiasque illius regionis peculiari amore prosequi volens, Apostolica sua auctoritate benigne decrevit ut in posterum Archiepiscopi Americae latinae universi privilegio concedendi octoginta dies de vera Indulgentia in forma Ecclesiae consueta frui ac uti libere valeant. Super quibus vero eadem Sanctitas Sua infrascripto Secretario S. Congregationis Negotiis Ecclesiasticis extraordinariis praepositae iussit hoc edi decretum sine ulla Brevis expeditione, idemque in acta ipsius S. Congregationis referri mandavit.

Datum ex Secretaria eiusdem S. Congregationis die, mense et anno ut supra.

FELIX CAVAGNIS, *Secretarius.*

E SACRA POENITENTIARIA.

IN VERIFICANDIS IMPEDIM. ET CAUSIS MATRIMONIALIUM DISPENSATIONUM, PRAETER TESTES, ORDINARIUS POTEST, SI VULT, INTERROGARE SPONSOS.

Sacra Poenitentiaria ad infrascriptum dubium Curiae Tropien.: An in verificandis impedimentis et causis matrimonialium dispensationum, facienda vel omittenda sit sponsorum interrogatio, et si omittenda, an sufficiat interrogare super omnibus duos testes fide dignos, respondet: rem pendere a prudenti arbitrio Ordinarii, perspectis peculiaribus cuiusvis casus circumstantiis, quae secumferant necessitatem vel utilitatem etiam sponsos, praeter testes, interrogandi.

Datum Romae ex S. Poenitentiaria die 5 Septembris 1899.

A. CARCANI, *S. P. Reg.*
I. PALICA, *S. P. Subst.*

Conferences.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman Documents for the month are:

I.—APOSTOLIC LETTER:

1. To the Bishops of Anglona (South Italy), condemning the habit of deferring the administration of Baptism in the case of children for weeks and months.

II.—S. CONGREGATION OF THE INQUISITION:

1. Answers a case regarding the dispensing power of bishops *ab impedimentis matrim. in articulo mortis.*
2. Decides to obtain a *sanatio* "quo SS. suppleat de Thesauro Ecclesiae" regarding Masses celebrated with hosts made of adulterated flour, where priests made use of the same in *bona* or in *dubia fide.*

III.—S. CONGREGATION OF INDULGENCES answers various doubts relative to the application of Indulgences of the Rosary Confraternity.

IV.—S. CONGREGATION FOR EXTRAORDINARY ECCLES. AFFAIRS grants to the Archbishops of South America the privilege of publishing an indulgence of eighty days.

V.—PENITENTIARY APOSTOLIC defines the rights of Ordinaries in examining witnesses before applying matrimonial dispensations.

MARRIAGE CEREMONIES DURING THE FORBIDDEN TIME (TEMPUS CLAUSUM).

It is well known that the law of the Church forbids the solemn celebration of nuptials from the beginning of Advent to the Epiphany, and again from Ash Wednesday till the Octave of Easter.

In many dioceses the statutes forbid, during these seasons, not only the *solemnitates nuptiarum*, but private marriages as well, so that the latter are never blessed without a dispensation from the Ordinary.

But general practice, especially in missionary countries, has interpreted the law of the Church as prohibiting, during the above-mentioned periods, the celebration of the votive nuptial Mass *pro Sponso et Sponsa*, to which a special and solemn blessing is attached, which blessing is not given apart from the Mass, though there is another provided in the Ritual for private marriage.

We have frequently been asked whether parties who wish to be married during Advent or Lent (that is, during the forbidden times) might be married with a Mass *de die*, at which they could communicate, since the Mass cannot be the *Missa pro Sponso et Sponsa*. In such a case, might the priest say a votive Mass on days when the Rubrics permit such, and could this Mass be a solemn or chanted Mass? Also, should the couple to be married be allowed to enter the sanctuary before the Mass, and again when they receive Holy Communion, or even remain there during the entire Mass, as is the custom in some churches?

There can be no doubt that the parties to be married during the forbidden season may have the ordinary blessing, by which the priest, in the name of the Church, witnesses the mutual contract. This blessing might be given immediately before the celebration of Mass, as well as at any other time, since the Rubrics do not specify the time. Thus, the newly-married couple, with the witnesses, are very properly induced to assist at a Mass and receive Holy Communion after the nuptial contract has been blessed.

What the Church intends by her law is not to limit legitimate devotion and a reverential reception of the Sacrament of Marriage, but to restrict the festive rejoicings, because these take the mind and heart away from the thoughts which should engross all Christians during the solemn penitential seasons preparatory to the celebration of Christmas and Easter. Hence, she forbids *solemn* celebration of marriage, and she seeks to enforce this restriction by withholding the exceptional and very beautiful blessing attached to the *Missa pro Sponso et Sponsa*, which Christian spouses may gain at other seasons when nuptial rejoicings do not interfere with the sober piety of penitential preparation.

The priest is entitled, therefore, to bless the marriage before Mass with the ordinary or private blessing which the Ritual assigns under the head of "Ritus celebrandi Matrimonii Sacramentum." Then he celebrates the Mass of the day, at which the newly-married receive Holy Communion.

Should they enter the sanctuary? It seems to us that it would be contrary to the spirit and the intention of the Church to allow this privilege at this season of the *tempus clausum*, even for the reception of the private nuptial blessing before Mass. It would practically eliminate the very obstacle the Church wishes to place against untimely solemnization of the marriage ceremony, however sacred that rite may be as a Sacrament.

In short, to fulfil the obligation of witnessing the marriage contract during the *tempus clausum*, the priest should, it seems to us, limit himself to the function described in the Ritual. By thus omitting, not only the blessings and prayers inserted in the *Missa pro Sponso et Sponsa*, but also everything else that might be mistaken by the faithful as a substitute for such omission, the spirit and dignity of the liturgy are maintained, and what might otherwise appear an odious discrimination becomes a sacred admonition to enter into the mind of the Church—*sentire cum Ecclesia.*

THE NEED OF CATHOLIC NORMAL SCHOOLS FOR WOMEN.

Some months ago[1] we directed attention to a movement in England that had resulted in the establishment of a Training College for Catholic (Women) Teachers, under the immediate auspices of the Catholic Hierarchy. This college was to compete simply on its merits, as a licensed educational establishment, with certain recognized Government centres of education. It would fit its pupils for the examinations required from candidates for diplomas, such as might be obtained in the Training College for Women authorized by the University of Cambridge, and by the Bedford Training College for Women, in London. It will be remembered that when some of the Catholic Sisters had proposed to attend the Cambridge Training College, for the purpose of civil qualification, the Council of the College passed a resolution which practically debarred the Sisters from attending the lectures and exercises. They inserted in the rules the following clause: "Nuns, *eligible educationally*, but *disqualified as wearing a distinctive dress*," may be received as visitors with privileges, etc.

This bigotry, which aroused the Sisters, under the high-minded encouragement of the Bishops, to open a training school at their own expense, and to contest the result with the pupils of the Cambridge Training College, has received a singular rebuke in the unanimous report of the Government inspectors, as to the efficiency of the Sisters' training, after a comparatively brief experiment and with limited resources, whilst there was much prejudice to overcome. One of the inspectors of the London Board, as *The Tablet* (London) reports, after noting the excellent discipline and perfect organization of the college of the Sisters, stated that in future "*nuns ought to lead the way in secondary education.*" To this unbiased testimony of the excellence of the Sisters' training, we may add another from an equally unsuspected and reliable source. An inspector from the London University was sent to the Sisters' Training College to hear the lesson of a student who wished to add the London diploma to her Cambridge one. "Seldom have I heard," he wrote, "a

[1] *Cf.* AM. ECCL. REVIEW, September, 1899, pp. 296–301.

lesson given on what I consider such good lines—the class under perfect control, and yet the happiest relations evidently existing between teacher and taught." Writing of the successes attained in 1898, yet another Government inspector, Mr. P. A. Barnett, said: "The candidates from this college had all been most carefully prepared, and their work showed that a very systematic training had been given in the preparation of matter to be presented to a class. The notes of lessons were scientifically arranged and were not too copious. The scheme of instruction I consider to be most sensible." In December last there were fifty-one applicants that passed the Syndicate examinations. Out of this number, which represented all England, four pupils obtained the highest note. Two of these were from the Sisters' Training College.

We are glad to be able to present to our readers a brief account of the Training College of which Mother St. Raphael, of the Sisters of the Holy Child, Cavendish Square, London, is the principal. There are, perhaps, difficulties in the way of introducing into other English-speaking countries precisely the same method of normal training schools as has proved itself practicable in England; but when we remember that we have the very same calibre of teachers at our command, since the Sisters of the Holy Child are all trained under a like method, we should attain some open results to point out the fallacy that convent education is in any sense or in any department unequal to the best that secular efforts can furnish.

And what is said here incidentally of the Sisters of the Holy Child is true of our other religious teaching communities, in proportion to their opportunities, and accordingly as they have preserved the *spirit* of their founders, and therefore realize what true progress in religious education means. Of course, in communities where religious discipline is held subservient to the glittering novelties of pedagogy, which attract for a time, there we can hope for no permanent good results in education. It is all flowers, and no ripening or consistent development.

On the whole, it may be safely assumed that the Sisters of our great teaching congregations are ready to take up and, as in the case we have just illustrated, to lead in the advance of education. What hinders them, or, rather, what they need, is

encouragement from the bishops and the clergy, such encouragement as the Cavendish Square community has received at the hands of Cardinal Vaughan and the English bishops. In what that encouragement is to consist, we need not explain here. Unless we are ready to make sacrifices to maintain Catholic education, we need not expect that our missionary work will bear lasting fruit, such as we are bound to cultivate—*ut fructum afferatis, et fructus vester maneat.*

We subjoin an outline of the constitution of the training department, as presently conducted by the Sisters of the Holy Child, in Cavendish Square:

TRAINING DEPARTMENT.

Recognized by the Cambridge Syndicate.

Patron: THE CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

Committee: The Duke of Norfolk; Right Rev. Mgr. Provost Barry, V.G.; The Marquess of Ripon; The Earl of Ashburnham; Very Rev. W. J. Richards, D.D.; Very Rev. John Gerard, S.J.; Wilfrid Ward, Esq.; Charles Kegan Paul, Esq.; B. F. C. Costelloe, Esq.

The object of this course is to give a professional training to educated women who intend to teach in Secondary Schools.

REQUIREMENTS FOR ENTRANCE.—These are mainly the same as for admission to the Cambridge Examination of Teachers, viz.:

No Candidate is admitted to the Examination unless she has either

1. Graduated in some University of the United Kingdom, or passed the Examination for Licentiate in Arts at St. Andrew's.

Or 2. Satisfied the Examiners in Parts I and II of the previous Examination.

Or 3. Obtained a Certificate in one of the Higher Local Examinations of Oxford or Cambridge.

Or 4. Obtained a Higher Certificate of the Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board.

Or 5. Satisfied the examiners in one of the Senior Local Examinations of the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, or Durham, in English or at least in one other language, ancient or modern, and in Euclid and Algebra.

[Women who have passed the Senior Local Examination may qualify by passing a separate Examination in any of the above-mentioned subjects in which they have not already passed.]

Or 6. Passed the Examination for Matriculation at the University of London.

Or 7. Passed the First University Examination in Arts of the Royal University of Ireland.

Or 8. Passed the Preliminary Examination of the Victoria University.

Or 9. In the Examination for Certificates conducted by the Education Department in taking the papers of the second year been placed in the First Division.

Or 10. Passed Associate Examination, College of Preceptors.

Candidates must have attained the age of twenty before taking the Diploma.

The Course of Study commences in January and extends over three terms of about ten weeks. It includes full preparation for the Examination for Teachers held in December by the University of Cambridge.

PLAN OF STUDY.—Theory of Education; School Hygiene; Art of Teaching; History of Education; School Organization; Methods; Psychology, Logic, Ethics.

PRACTICAL WORK.—Students are allowed to practise in Secondary and Elementary Schools in the neighborhood. These Lessons are carefully supervised and criticized.

FEES.—For Tuition, Board, and Residence, £60 per annum.
Washing Extra.
For Day Students, 9 Guineas a Term.
All Fees Payable in Advance.

THE SERVICE ON HOLY SATURDAY MORNING.

Qu. Permit me to propose a practical question, and an opportune.

My aged pastor, who loves the solemnities of Holy Week, and who is jealous of the honor and privilege of participating as the celebrant on each morning of Passiontide, is looking forward again this year—it may be the last, he says; but I trust not—to continue an unbroken practice of well-nigh half a century. Fearing the long and trying ceremony of Holy Saturday morning, last year he had me attend to the opening ceremonies whilst he confined himself to the Prophecies and the Mass. I have reason to believe that he has in mind the same expedient this year. Now, I would gladly gratify the old gen-

tleman's wish, if I was sure such a practice is in harmony with the Rubrics; and he himself desires always to be on the side of the law. But he relies on me in such matters, and as I am now in doubt, I hope you will pardon me for turning to the REVIEW, and asking you for a decision which may also be of service to other readers just at this time.

Resp. The Rubrics regulating the ceremonies of Holy Saturday suppose that there is but one celebrant who performs all the functions in successive order as indicated in the Missal.

In this connection we may mention that the question has been raised whether one priest could perform the Blessings and another celebrate the Mass, both succeeding each other in the prescribed order. De Herdt[1] seems to favor the affirmative in cases of necessity or of long-established custom. In support of this opinion he cites a number of decisions given by the S. Congregation in favor of particular churches. But we doubt the validity of this inference, because the same congregation has in several instances plainly refused to sanction the practice, intimating that the ceremonies must be performed by one and the same celebrant. Hence the references given by De Herdt merely prove that in the estimation of the S. Congregation the functions of Holy Saturday are not necessarily inseparable, and that in particular cases it might actually dispense from the Rubric prescribing their performance by one and the same priest.

A writer in the *Ephemerides Liturgicae* (February, 1887) adopts this view and strenuously defends it, showing that, although the ceremonies of the Blessings on Holy Saturday are "divisibiles et posse ab uno fieri Benedictionem fontis, ab alio Missam cantari," nevertheless a special dispensation is required in each case, since such is the tenor of the liturgical laws. "Ita Rubrica, ita Decreta, ita congruentes rationes, ad quorum exigentiam maxime peroptandum, ut omnes sese ecclesiae accomodent." De Herdt cites one instance where the request to allow one priest to perform the Blessings and another to celebrate the Mass was refused by the S. Congregation; but there are also a number of decisions later than the one he gives, to the same

[1] *Praxis* III, n. 57, ed. 8.

effect, namely, "*usum contrarium decretis*," showing that the burden of former decrees is opposed to the practice.

It should be added, however, that the bishop may perform the Blessings and delegate another priest to act as celebrant of the Mass—"est enim illi potestas delegandi, et quod in casu per alium facit, per seipsum facere videtur, cum delegatus Episcopi nomine celebret." [2]

IMPROVED FONT FOR HOLY WATER.

Editor, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

During the past few weeks there has been going the rounds of the press—for I have seen it, I should say, in a dozen different places—a paragraph referring to the prevalence of all sorts of disease-germs in the Holy Water fonts at the entrance to our churches. I take it for granted that the general statement is true, for the paragraph is quoted from eminent medical journals, both European and American.

Now I do not say that this discovery need cause any great alarm, for I am now at the conclusion that he who would be germ-proof must go disappointed in this world, or cease to breathe, and eat, and drink, and taste, and touch, and look, and what not. At the same time it seems to me no more than is right and proper that pastors should remove this danger, as far as may be, and exercise, here as elsewhere, due regard for the safety of those who may look to them legitimately for such protection. Therefore, I am sending you for publication, if you think it worth while, an extract from the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, which seems to suggest a simple way out of the trouble.

"There has been devised a container which promises, if it can be substituted for the old-fashioned font, to prevent future danger. This is a narrow-necked jar inverted in a shallow basin, so that the outflow from the jar ceases as soon as the water in the basin covers the neck of the jar. One end of a bent tube filled with hair is immersed in water in the basin, and the other end, overhanging the edge, delivers a constant stream of small drops raised by the capillarity of the hair. All these parts are enclosed in an ornamental oaken case, somewhat resembling that of a timepiece. This case projects from the wall, and the stream of drops falls through an opening in the bottom of the case into a receptacle which at once carries away the excess, and the congregation on entering the church have merely to hold their fingers in the stream for an instant. The apparatus was submitted to Monseigneur van de Wetering, Archbishop of Utrecht, who expressed his approval of it."

[2] *Ephem. Lit.*, loc. cit.; *cf.* AM. ECCL. REVIEW, Vol. VI, 1892, p. 313.

And so say we all of us. But will we adopt the new device? That is another story, especially for those who have been to some expense in furnishing the vestibules of their churches with fine marble fonts and stoups—angels holding forth shells, and the like. Nevertheless, something should be done to lessen a danger which undoubtedly exists in our fonts, exposed as they are to the dust and dirt and the dip of indiscriminate fingers, being singled out by any ill-disposed sanitary inspector at any moment for attack, as being a culture-medium of germs and bacilli *et id genus omne* and a source of contagion and infection. Let us put away the dirt-harboring sponges, especially in our colleges and convents, and insist on systematic care of our fonts, thoroughly cleansing them at least once a week, and this charge will be avoided and a proper precaution instituted—

PRO BONO PUBLICO.

PORTABLE SCHOOL-HOUSES.

The shifting population of some of our large industrial cities, such as Milwaukee and St. Louis, has induced the public authorities in these cities to make experiments with portable school-houses in which to provide instruction for otherwise vagrant children, especially of the immigrant classes. As these experiments are said to have proved eminently successful, we feel justified in suggesting their adoption in many places where the necessity of a parochial school is admitted, but where the lack of sufficient funds for their erection is an effectual bar to Catholic education. Many priests would gladly build a school if they saw their way to realizing the amount of money required for the purchase of a site and for the putting up of a suitable building; for if these expenses were covered they might readily see their way to maintaining one or two teachers and other requisites for properly instructing the children of their flock.

The structures of which we speak cost about seven hundred and fifty dollars ($750.00) each, with accommodation for fifty-five children. They are made in sections, fastened securely with bolts, so that they can be taken down, removed, and set up anywhere on such foundation as may be available. Each has six windows, and the end wall is made into a blackboard. A stove furnishes all the heat required. These school-houses take

the place very advantageously of the vacant dwellings and rooms which must otherwise be hired for schools. The *American Architect and Building News*, from which we glean this account, further adds: "Taxpayers in cities will observe that these structures provide what seems to be suitable accommodation for the children at a cost of less than fourteen dollars per head, while the ordinary brick city school-house costs, as a rule, from one hundred and fifty to two hundred dollars per pupil, and is far more costly to maintain, and, usually, less satisfactory in lighting and ventilation than the simple one-story structures, with windows on each side. It would, of course, be inadvisable to abandon the system of providing large brick buildings for graded schools; but in the newer parts of large and growing cities, such portable structures could be extensively employed with great advantage to the municipal treasury, as well as to the children, who are often obliged, in newly built quarters, to go for months and even years without proper school accommodation, while the slow processes of purchasing a site, securing an appropriation, and erecting a building are going on."

The motives which suggest the adoption of such structures by the municipal authorities seem to appeal with even greater force to the Catholic pastor in similar circumstances.

WAS IT LICIT TO SAY THE "MISSA PRO SPONSIS"?

Qu. Paul and Catharine (not a widow) are engaged to be married, and the bans have actually been proclaimed. Both desire to be married with nuptial Mass, but family considerations make it necessary that the ceremony be performed about four o'clock in the afternoon. The *ordo* shows a semi-double feast for the day set for the wedding. The pastor resolves the case as follows: At eight o'clock A.M. he says the votive Mass *pro Sponso et Sponsa*, and at the usual time inserts the special blessing *pro sponsa*. Paul and Catharine receive Holy Communion at the Mass. At four o'clock P.M. the couple again come to the church, when the usual marriage ceremony is performed; and the pastor congratulates all parties, himself included, on his cuteness in solving difficulties.

Was the pastor's action proper in the circumstances?

Resp. The Rubrics of the Missal plainly indicate that the *Missa pro Sponso et Sponsa* is intended as a solemnity of the actual marriage rite, and cannot be lawfully said as a mere votive Mass for persons who propose to be married at some other time. The very words of the Mass are rendered absurd as being addressed to such persons.

ANALYZED ALTAR WINE.

Qu. Analysis of a certain wine which was recommended to me by a friend as pure altar wine, showed the following result:

Specific gravity	1.0032
Residue after evaporation	11.09%
Ash	0.15%
Total acidity (calculated as tartaric acid)	0.64%
Alcohol (by weight)	9.73%
or (by volume)	11.73%
Sulphurous acid	0.004%
Boric acid present.	
Salicylic acid absent.	

Can this wine be licitly used, or does it affect the validity of the Holy Sacrifice as long as I am certain that the wine is really grape wine, but, as you would call it, "doctored"?

Resp. From the above analysis it is apparent that there are two foreign ingredients in the wine—sulphurous acid and boric acid. Neither of these acids is natural to the grape, nor is either of them a product of natural fermentation. It is possible that the sulphurous acid was not added to the must or to the fermented wine. Legitimately, sulphur matches are burned inside the cask, merely to free the wood from disease-bearing germs; and the wine being introduced into the cask, traces of sulphuric acid may be developed in the wine. This fact could be determined only by the testimony of the maker of the wine. Not having testimony as to how the sulphurous acid came into the wine, one should look upon the wine as suspect.

However, with regard to the boric acid there is no room for doubt. This acid is added to new wines that have not been naturally completely fermented. The boric acid arrests

the natural fermentation and "preserves" the still unfermented wine, thus permitting the seller to dispose of a beverage that is not, and never will be, *vinum de vite*. Evidently such "preserved" wines are not licit.

FATHER RUSSELL'S VERSES FOR PRIESTS.

Among the literary productions from ecclesiastical sources, to which the REVIEW makes it its special mission to direct the attention of its readers, are the poems of Father Matthew Russell, S.J. Many of them deal with topics of the priest's sacred calling and appeal to the sacerdotal heart. We give a few samples of the kind of thought which the honored editor of the *Irish Monthly* puts in verse:

The Mass Offered for the Four Ends of Sacrifice.

ADORE till the Gospel,
Give thanks till the bell,
Till Communion ask pardon,
Then all your wants tell.

I. LATREUTICAL SACRIFICE.

Gloria in Excelsis Deo!

O GOD invisible, eternal Lord!
Being Supreme, alone to be adored!
By Thee alone all things that are were made—
To Thee, O God, alone is duly paid
The solemn rite of Sacrifice. To Thee,
With head bowed down, heart hushed, and bended knee,
We give the homage of our creaturehood,
O infinitely great and wise and good!
We praise Thee, bless, adore, and glorify:
Glory to God! glory to God on high!
With all on earth who worship, serve, and love,
With all Thy angels and Thy saints above,
We join in this dread mystic immolation,
The world-wide Holy Mass, the clean oblation

Offered from rising unto setting sun
O'er all the earth till earth's great work be done—
The all-sufficing, only sacrifice,
Of man's redemption fullest pledge and price,
Renewed each morn with bloodless hallowed rite—
Of worth and power supreme and infinite,
And therefore worthy, O my God, of Thee.
Glory on high to God the Father be!
And glory be to Jesus Christ His Son,
And to the Holy Ghost, while endless ages run.

II. Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro.

WE thank Thee, O good God, for all the love
That from Thy everlasting throne above
Has flowed down on Thy lowly creatures here.
We bless and thank Thee, while we hope and fear—
Hope all through Thee, and fear ourselves alone.
Thy graces o'er our lives are thickly strown.
We thank Thee, Lord, we love Thee, and we bless
For having drawn us forth from nothingness,
For having sought us out, forlorn and lost,
For having purchased us at such a cost!
For all the gifts of nature and of grace
That Thou hast showered on all the human race;
And for the special graces of our lot
Lavished on us who have deserved them not.
But all the gratitude of all Thy saints
Is poor and impotent, it fails and faints
To thank Thee even for the love, O God,
That makes one daisy spring from grassy sod.
What, then, for all the bounties of Thy grace?
We cannot thank Thee, Lord, but in our place
Thy Son has paid for us the fullest price
In this great eucharistic sacrifice.
Oh! may our hearts, to Thy sweet yoke subdued,
Melt utterly away in loving gratitude.

III. Sacrifice of Propitiation.

Nobis quoque peccatoribus.

THE Victim now upon the altar lies,
And, slain anew 'neath sacred symbols, cries
For God's sweet mercy on His creatures lowly
And us poor sinners. Holy, Holy, Holy
Art Thou, O God, but *we* are sinners all.
Before Thy sovereign majesty we fall,
And call upon Thy mercy in our need.
O Lamb of God, who by Thy blood hast freed
The world from sin, wash all our sins away.
Forgive, O Father, those for whom we pray;
Look on Thy Christ in Whom well pleased Thou art,
And bid the tempters of our souls depart.
Let not the bolt of Thy just wrath be hurled—
Forgive us, and, O Lord! forgive Thy sinful world.

IV. Sacrifice of Impetration.

Aperis tu manum tuam, Domine.

JESUS, my Lord! assuage my soul's distress:
I will not let Thee go until Thou bless.
Bless me and mine and all for whom I plead;
Before we speak, Thou knowest, Lord, our need
Far better than our need ourselves we know—
Save us from sin and hell and endless woe.
Take pity on the poor, the sick, the sad:
Confirm the good, and Oh! convert the bad.
Sustain the tempted till the foe hath fled;
Help, help the dying! help the happy dead!
Grant or refuse our prayers as seemeth best,
But save us, save us, Lord!—to Thee we leave the rest.

The Priest's Communion Day.

"COMMUNION Day!" What holy power,
What memories haunt that name,
Since, long desired, the happy hour
Of First Communion came—

Renewed each month. And, when I caught
The Lord's low *Come away*,
The needed strength more oft I sought
In sweet Communion Day.

But now not *one* bright day from all
The thirty or the seven—
Each morn 'tis mine (O God!) to call
The Word made Flesh from heaven:
The Victim-God is Priest, 'tis true,
Yet I, poor child of clay,
What saints have hardly dared to do
Must dare to do each day.

"*This is My Body, take and eat:*
Who eateth not shall die.
Taste ye and see the Lord is sweet—
Nay, fear not, it is I!
Do this in memory of My love—
Thou art a Priest for aye."
O God! O Gift all gifts above!
'Tis mine, alas! each day.

"*Alas!* Thus welcome ye your King?"
Glory to God on high!
Yet, yet, alas! the thought doth bring
First to these lips a sigh.
But Thou, the Gladdener of my youth,[1]
Wilt make the sad heart gay;
For is not priestly life, in sooth,
One calm Communion Day?

And these meek worshippers who bend,
While I must stand in fear;
They, too, for whom my prayers ascend,
The loved ones far and near:
May we, when sacramental veils
Are drawn aside for aye,
Meet at that Feast which never fails,
The true Communion Day!

[1] *Ad Deum qui lætificat juventutem meam.*

RE-BLESSING STATIONS OF THE CROSS.

Qu. I have looked up Rubrics in every conceivable place for answers to the following questions, without success, and now turn to the REVIEW for the solutions:

1. In the event of one of the crosses of the Stations being lost, whether it is necessary to re-bless all the crosses or simply the one that is replaced?

2. Do the faithful gain the indulgences of the Stations of the Cross during the time one of the crosses happens to be missing?

Resp. 1. Not only are the crosses that remained in place not to be re-blessed, but not even the replaced cross is to be re-blessed. "Si cruces primitus benedictae omnino pereant, iterum canonica erectio necessaria est; si pereant ex minori parte,[1] licet alias substituere absque ulla benedictione." (*Decr. Auth. S. C. Indulg.*, Jan. 30, 1839.)

2. The temporary removal of some or even of all the crosses from the place of their original erection, with the intention of replacing them, does not annul the indulgences. During the period of absence of all the crosses, or of half their number, the indulgences are suspended. The temporary absence of one or other of the crosses, as might occur, for instance, during repairs or the painting of the wall on which they hang, seems not to interfere with the indulgences. This is the teaching of Beringer, in the place cited above, where he refers to various decrees, amongst others the following: "Non amittuntur benedictio et indulgentiae, si una vel altera tantum crux removeatur a pariete ecclesiae ad illam dealbandam: sed si simul omnes cruces removeantur, ut postea iterum ponantur in dicta ecclesia, fideles eo tempore lucrari nequeunt indulgentias, si in aliam ecclesiam vel oratorium translatae sint cruces sine Apostolica facultate." (*Decr. Auth.* d. 20 Jun. 1836.)

[1] Not more than six. Beringer, *Die Ablässe*, Paderborn, Fred. Schöningh, 1895, p. 277, n. 2.

Recent Bible Study.

THE editor of the *Expository Times*[1] is of opinion that the whole dispute gathered round Dr. Briggs, since his conversion to the Episcopal Church, may be expressed in a single sentence. Does the Bible *contain* the word of God, or *is* it the word of God? If the Bible merely contains the word of God, we may cast away the Book of Judges as not conducive to edification, and replace it by the Imitation of Christ; if the Bible is the word of God, then its every part is the word of God, and it is quite useless to speak of degrees of inspiration. Dr. A. Schulz Braunsberg,[2] in his opening lecture as Professor of Sacred Scripture, insisted on the same truth that the Bible is the word of God. He compared the word of God written with the word of God incarnate, drawing attention to a number of striking analogies. We cannot, however, agree with his view that the rejection of verbal inspiration constitutes Biblical Nestorianism, ascribing part of the authorship of the Bible to God and part to the inspired writer, and uniting these two parts by a moral bond of unity.

A new *Biblical Introduction* has been issued by the joint labor of W. H. Bennett and W. F. Adeney, the former furnishing the material for the Old Testament, the latter for the New.[3] The book gives a moderate exposition of recent work on Sacred Scripture; its style is popular rather than technical, and its main characteristic is accuracy. It may interest our readers to learn that F. Godet's *Introduction to the New Testament*, Vol. II, Division I, has appeared in its authorized English translation.[4] Since the author's plan is to deal first with the collection of the Gospels, then with each synoptic Gospel sep-

[1] February, 1900, p. 193.

[2] *Germania, Beilage*, nn. 5, 6, Februar 1, 8, 1900.

[3] Methuen. Crown 8vo, pp. 486.

[4] From the French, by William Affleck, B.D. New York: Imported by Chas. Scribner's Sons.

arately, and only in the last place with the synoptic problem, the present volume comprises only what pertains to the collection of the four Gospels and to the Gospel of Matthew. In the first chapter, Godet supports the opinion of Zahn against Harnack, that the unique position of the Gospels is to be attributed to the use made of them in the public readings of the different churches rather than to their use as a weapon against Gnosticism and Montanism. The author believes that "the union of the four Gospels in a single volume must have taken place, if not under the eyes and with the participation of John, at least a short time after his departure, and with the certainty of his approval."

The importance of and the grounds for the Apostolic origin of the New Testament have been briefly reviewed by P. L. Méchineau in two articles—*L'Origine Apostolique du Nouveau Testament.*[5] It should not be imagined that the overthrow of the Tübingen theory has brought the criticisms of the New Testament to a standstill. Weiss, the well-known conservative critic, finds several documents in the Gospels which he estimates according to a scale of ascending and descending value. Holtzmann, another conservative writer, and the author of the far-famed *Hand Kommentar*, ascribes the incidents of the Gospel history to various legendary origins. Dr. Stalker, in the *Contemporary Review* for January, is of opinion that "it is more than possible that within the next decade the Gospels may be issued from the press printed in all the colors of the rainbow, to indicate the different documents of which they are composed, as is happening to the books of the Old Testament at the present hour. The materials already exist in abundance for such an effort, and only a bold hand is required to appropriate them." In the case of the first three Gospels, it is especially the synoptic problem and its various solutions that will furnish the foregoing materials. In spite of Hilgenfeld's vigorous protests,[6] the double-source hypothesis of Matthew, Mark, and Luke is accepted by most New Testament critics,

[5] *Études*, Jan. 20, pp. 220 ff.; Feb. 20, pp. 492 ff.

[6] *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1899, pp. 481–507; *Marcosia novissima*, 507.

Harnack and Holtzmann among the rest. Although J. Hawkins, in his *Horae Synopticae*,[7] does not pretend to decide the question finally, still he approaches the foregoing solution so closely as to elicit the unanimous praise of the critics.[8] Lic. Paul Wernle, Privatdocent at the University of Basel, arrives at a slightly different solution in his work, *Die Synoptische Frage*.[9] According to him, both Luke and Matthew made use of Mark and of another common source, consisting mainly of discourses; a third source is required for the parts peculiar to Luke. Wernle's curt dismissal of the tradition that Matthew was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic, contrasts strikingly with Godet's modest avowal that both on internal and external grounds he is constrained to recognize the distinction between the original Aramaic writing of the Apostle Matthew and the Greek canonical Gospel; this latter author, too, accounts for the resemblance of Mark and Matthew, not by the use of one by the other, but by a common dependence on oral tradition. The argument of W. C. Allen[10] and Eb. Nestle,[11] that the genealogy in the first Gospel must have been taken from the genealogies in the Septuagint version of Paralipomenon, and that the author therefore must have written in Greek, is not conclusive; for not to speak of the possibility that Matthew, even if writing in Hebrew, might have made use of the Greek version of the Old Testament, there always remains the probability that Matthew's Greek translator had recourse to the Greek translation of Paralipomenon. Palmer, in his *Gospel Problems and Their Solution*,[12] arrives at the conclusion that the reports of Christ's longer addresses were taken down as they were spoken, and that these notes were afterwards used in constructing our Gospels; this is the master-key to the problems. Special keys are: (1) Jesus spoke Aramaic in Galilee and Greek in Jerusalem; now, the synoptic Gospels contain

[7] *Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899.

[8] *Cf. Theol. Literaturztg.*, 1899, p. 626.

[9] Freiburg: B. Mohr; *cf. Theol. Rundschau*, 1899, pp. 140–51.

[10] "The Genealogy in St. Matthew and its Bearing on the Original Language of the Gospel;" *Expository Times*, Dec., 1899, pp. 135–37.

[11] *Expository Times*, Jan., 1900, p. 191.

[12] London: H. R. Allenson, 1899.

the translated Aramaic discourses, while the fourth Gospel contains the Greek. (2) The reports were drawn up by the disciples in each other's company; hence flow the similarities, identities, and peculiarities of the Gospels. (3) The reports in Matthew and Luke were disarranged before they were redacted. Mr. Palmer will have to advance strong arguments indeed to convince his readers that shorthand reporters were found among the members of the Apostolic college.

Dr. Karl Weiss publishes a study on the introduction of the fourth Gospel,[13] in which he considers each statement of the evangelist as a contradiction or a correction of an error of his time. It is especially verses 5 and 13 of the first chapter that receive a great deal of new light by means of this apologetic treatment. Th. Calmes, too, writes an article, "Étude sur le prologue du quatrième évangile,"[14] in which he mainly labors to defend the traditional interpretation of the passage against the opinions of Loisy, Resch, and Baldensperger. Passing now from the introduction of the fourth Gospel to its account of the Last Supper, we find that P. J. Brucker[15] mentions an opinion concerning the day of the supper, advanced by M. D. Chvolson several years ago, but which has not received the attention it appears to deserve.[16] Christ was crucified on Friday, Nisan 14; the paschal lamb had been *slain* and *offered* by all the Jews on Thursday, Nisan 13; while most Jews *ate* the lamb only on Friday, Nisan 14, Jesus and His disciples conformed to the practice of the minority and ate the paschal lamb on the day of its immolation. This theory satisfies most of the difficulties connected with this part of the Gospel history; we cannot here inquire into the solidity of its foundation. M. D. Chvolson himself was born in Judaism, and was converted to Christianity in 1855; since then he has been professor of Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac at the University of St. Petersburg. J. H. Thayer considers the Last Supper from a doctrinal point of view, collecting and reviewing the various opinions on the subject in an

[13] "Der Prolog des heiligen Johannes, eine Apologie in Antithesen;" Freiburg: Herder, 1899; *Strassburger Theol. Studien*, iii. Band, 2-3 Heft.

[14] *Revue biblique*, Jan., 1900, pp. 5-29.

[15] *Etudes*, Feb. 5, 1900, pp. 387 f.

[16] *Das letzte Passamahl Christi*, St. Petersburg, 1892.

article, "Recent Discussion Respecting the Lord's Supper."[17] According to the writer, the supper combines many elements—the commemorative, the symbolic, the piacular, the covenant, the passover, mystical incorporation; it is to be regretted that only the literal meaning of the evangelist's account has been omitted. We should be grateful to the writer if he would kindly advance a good reason for his agreement with Holtzmann regarding the clause "do this for a commemoration of me." Why are we to believe that these words were not spoken, but only implied in the circumstances?

The second of the four points ascribed to Dr. McGiffert, and disowned by the Presbyterian Church, reads: "The discrediting of the view so long accepted by the Church that the third Gospel and the Book of Acts were written by St. Luke, the companion of St. Paul, and the suggestion that they were more probably the work of some writer living in the latter part of the first century, a generation after the death of the Apostle." Dr. McGiffert had expressed such views in his *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*.[18] On the other hand, Blass becomes more emphatic in urging his opinion that the Book of Acts was written by Luke, not once, but twice. In his article, "Zu den zwei Texten der Apostelgeschichte,"[19] he not only advances some new evidence collected from the Vulgate MS. Parisinus and from the Book of Armagh, but also replies to the two articles of Harnack,[20] in which the latter had claimed to demolish Blass's theory concerning the text of Acts, partly on the evidence of the newly discovered Athos MS. John Macpherson asks: *Was there a Second Imprisonment of Paul in Rome?*[21] and concludes that there is no good evidence for such a view. We hardly need to remind our readers that, according to the more generally accepted system of Pauline chronology, there can be no doubt as to the fact of Paul's double Roman imprisonment.

[17] *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1899, pp. 110-31.

[18] *Cf.* "The Authorship of Acts," *Expositor*, 1898, i, pp. 1–20.

[19] *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, Heft i, 1900, pp. 5–28.

[20] *Sitzungsbericht der Kgl. Preussischen Akademie zu Berlin*, 1899, xi, pp. 150–76; xvii, pp. 316–27.

[21] *American Journal of Theology*, January, 1900, pp. 23–48.

Book Review.

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY. GOD. Being a Contribution to a Philosophy of Theism. By the Rev. John T. Driscoll, S.T.L. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1900. Pp. xvi—342.

There is no dearth of books by non-Catholic writers on the Philosophy of Theism. Many of them are interesting, persuasive, on the whole convincing; but all betray more or less patently the lack of a consistent philosophical basis. Though written oftentimes by men of splendid mental endowments and culture, they show the weakness and inconsecutiveness of thought that, from a psychological standpoint, must be the condition of the mind uninformed by the synthesis of truth in which reason and faith, a continuous philosophy and a continuous theology, harmoniously combine. The arguments for the existence of God can indeed be discovered and formulated by pure reason unaided by faith; but, as a fact, they are seldom, if ever, fully and consistently developed by one who has not mastered the traditional philosophy that is the logical basis of faith and systematized framework of Catholicism. It is here that the Catholic philosopher has the advantage over the non-Catholic, that his mind is disciplined in a system of truth that is consecutive throughout, one that has stood the critical testing of centuries and assimilated to its ever-living organism the ascertained truth of the ages. With him the arguments for the existence of God are but the logical evolution of certain definite ontological concepts and principles, rigorously examined by the Philosophy of Mind and of Knowledge, and carefully adjusted to the data of experience, physical science, ethics, and history. All this is well known to those who have compared the popular literature of Theism with the Latin manuals of Natural Theology. Unfortunately the number of works in English on this subject by Catholic writers is small. The present newest addition to the number deserves, therefore, a welcome, deserves it on the ground both of method and of matter.

Those who have read the author's former work on the Philosophy of the Soul will expect to find here the scholastic arguments unfolded in close relation to experience and physical science,—the only method that may hope to win attention in this age. Herein they will not be disappointed. The book opens with a short study of present-day

agnosticism, in which the origin and growth, the true inwardness, influence, etc., of this mental and moral disorder are examined. Another "fact" is then brought to the front, the consciousness, namely, in the human mind of the idea of God. This "psychological fact" is shown to be universal in place and time. History and philology are searched in testimony to this statement. Two questions now present themselves. First, as to the origin of the ubiquitous consciousness of God. The second, as to its grounds or bases. The answers of Innatism, Evolutionism, and Theosophy, to the first question, are subjected to criticism, and the teaching of Christian Philosophy explained and defended. In answer to the second question, the Theistic line of argument properly opens out. The first ground the author finds close to the idea itself,—the necessity of God's existence as the ultimate basis of all intelligibility. The content of the universal idea, the objective validity of first principles and of ratiocination postulate an ultimate, necessary, immutable and eternal basis, which is none other than the Divine Essence. This line of proof is shown to be not, as it might at first sight appear, *a priori*. It is based on an analysis of objective truth, though in correlation with our mental operations. It is *a posteriori* and differs from the arguments of St. Anselm, Descartes, Leibnitz, etc. The proof from the moral order,—from conscience as the consciousness of right and wrong, of obligation and of sanction to the moral order,—as also from the fundamental desires of human nature for goodness, truth, happiness, etc., is proved to be solid and convincing, if not by itself, at least as subsidiary to other arguments.

The two foregoing proofs are based on an analysis of human consciousness, mental and moral, viewed, as we have said, not *a priori*, but as furnishing empirical data inexplicable outside the hypothesis of God's existence. The course of argument is next directed to the external order. The most striking feature of the world of things is its changeableness. In this we note (*a*) the *things* that change; (*b*) the *change* itself; (*c*) the *cause* of change; (*d*) the *order* in the changes. On these aspects of things four arguments are founded: the argument from contingency, from efficient casualty, from motion, and from order or finality. These are set forth with a fund of interesting illustration from the natural sciences and with constant allusion to modern criticism.

The leading arguments for God's existence having been drawn out, the mode of origin of the universe is next established. Pantheistic and Dualistic theories, old and new, are examined and refuted,

and the doctrine of creation explained and established. The Unity of God is then demonstrated; His Providence vindicated; the relation and efficacy of prayer and miracles defended. The mystery of evil is carefully studied, and at some length. Pessimism, ancient and modern, and the various theories of Utilitarianism and Hedonism are criticised in this connection. A chapter on the meaning and spheres of the Natural and Supernatural fittingly closes the treatise.

A careful reading of the work will not fail, we believe, to impress the mind with a sense of the forcefulness of the reasoning and the appropriateness and vitality of the illustrations. The book will be helpful to the seminarian as supplementary reading to the Latin manual of Theodicy, to the priest as an aid to instructing the weak in faith, to Christian young men and women who, coming as they do in frequent contact with agnosticism in society and in literature, need fuller and deeper knowledge of the primary foundations of their faith and ready answers to specious sophistries. The student of philosophy, as well as the general reader, will be helped by the numerous bibliographical references.

The author's temper in criticism of opponents is, on the whole, calm and moderate. Just occasionally one might desiderate a more modest attitude, as, for instance, where we are told that the opinion that finds a contradiction in an infinite number is "without any warrant whatsoever, is known to be false," etc. (p. 112). A closer attention to the style would have benefited the work. The sentences are sometimes choppy, and repetitions of like-sounding words mar their harmony, as, for instance, the unnecessary superlatives, very, very, p. 7, § 7, and own, own, p. 10, § 14. Some inaccuracies of expression are noticeable, as, for instance, *sensitive* appearances, p. 8, § 10. Kant did not, we believe, hold that the "mind *creates* in itself" its forms and categories, but that these are inborn (p. 9, § 13).

Some flaws escaped the proof-reader or printer, such, for instance, as the double p in Schopenhauer, and the o in Diman (*passim*), and *gives* for *give* (p. 63, § 1). These are, of course, trifling blemishes, but one dislikes to see specks on a fair work of art, especially when its rivals owe so much of their success to flawlessness of form.

IDYLS OF KILLOWEN. A Soggarth's Secular Verses. London: James Bowden. 1899. VESPERS AND COMPLINE. A Soggarth's Sacred Verses. London: Burns & Oates. 1900. ALTAR FLOWERS. A Book of Prayers in Verse. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1900.

These three contributions to the Catholic poetry of our English literature are due to the elegant and facile Muse of that veteran *littérateur*, the Rev. Matthew Russell, S.J., who had previously laid us under so many obligations by his *St. Joseph's Anthology* and *Sonnets on the Sonnet* (both of which volumes were reviewed, on their appearance, in the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW). We might still further swell the list of our obligations to him by some notice of his *Moments Before the Tabernacle, At Home Near the Altar, Close to the Altar Rails, Lyra Cordis* (Hymns to the Sacred Heart), *All Day Long*, etc. But we desire specifically to call attention to the three volumes which, while appearing almost simultaneously, nevertheless represent the gleanings of a lifetime devoted to sacred and secular—and evidently most happy—journeyings into the fields of poesy. Real journeyings! For the exquisite culture manifested by the poems is not such as warns us of the mere closet scholar and thinker, but of the large-hearted laborer in the Master's vineyard, whose personal love goes out to the subjects of his thought, and whose sympathies are as much with men as with books. Of the first volume, the author says: "The verses are called KILLOWEN IDYLS, because many of them are concerned about rustic themes and scenes, and were inspired by recollections of early years spent in Killowen, a country district in County Down, stretching along the northern shore of Carlingford Lough, between Rostrevor and Mourne." The themes are racy of the soil—"The Irish Farmer's Sunday Morning," "A Picnic at Rostrevor," "Down by the Dodder," "The Irish Children's First Communion," are titles selected almost at random from the full contents-page. Among the more serious poems is interspersed not a little "elegant trifling" with intricacies of rhyme, reminding us of the feats essayed and so charmingly accomplished by James Clarence Mangan in his rhymes for *Blackwater* and *Bosphorus*. The poet who pretended to find himself at a loss for a "rhyme for Tipperary," and then proceeded to bewail the refractory character of that word in many a rhymic refrain, has been outdone by both Mangan and Father Russell. Catching a suggestion from Wordsworth's *Yarrow Unvisited*, Father Russell gives us *The Yarra-Yarra Unvisited*, and astounds us

with the rhymic fertility waiting to be harvested—"Yarra-Yarra" losing its terrors when we are broad enough in our horizons to include Gougaune Barra, Sahara, Connemara, Kinvara, *avis rara*, *Che sarà sarà* ("The accent slightly I misplace," as the author admits, "To coax a rhyme for Yarra-Yarra"). But the next stanza makes up abundantly for the partial defect of this questionable rhyme of *Che sara sara*, and proves to us that the embarrassment was only temporary and trifling:

"More musical than new Adare
Its olden name, Athdara,
And Tennyson's meek Lady Clare
Grows statelier as Clara.
Had not my Muse such gems to spare
For gemming thy tiara,
She would not waste a double share
On this one stanza, Yarra."

The singer admits that

"There is not unity of theme,
I grant it, in these stanzas;
The subjects as far sundered seem
As Kensington and Kansas.
'Twere better if in graceful round
My thoughts could move—but arrah!
What can a poet do, who's bound
To close each verse with Yarra?"

Broad as are these horizons, he reminds us that there are still "sundry rhymes in store, historic, topographic," such as Lara, Bokhara, Carrara, Marat; but a sense of being once more at home is pleasantly insinuated by the last rhyme of all—*Tara*:

"But now my harp as mute must grow
As that which hangs at Tara.
Farewell, dear maid from Bendigo!
Farewell, O Yarra-Yarra!"

In "A Birthday in Religion" the author touches—and with a tenderness that begets a kindred tenderness in the reader—a purely personal chord. A friendship that could justify such an acknowledgment as the following must surely have been priceless:

"I feel it hard, and very hard to hold—
The world grows wicked as the world grows old.
Through many a changeful year I've breathed its air
And found it ever genial, bracing, fair."

Very beautiful is the one "Prose Idyl" in this volume, entitled, "Monotony and the Lark." The closing lines of the volume ("Land! Land!") possess the added attraction of being among the last that interested Mr. Gladstone on his deathbed. They form a rondeau on the text of "My Dying Hour," and appeared in the author's previous work, "Sonnets on the Sonnet," under a different title—"My Last Rondeau."

We have left ourselves little space for a notice of the "Vespers and Compline"—a volume of sacred verse. The titles and treatments are so interesting to the priestly heart, however, that we should be tempted to quote with such a liberality as to infringe the spirit, if not the letter, of the copyright law. Here is one short poem:

A YOUNG PRIEST'S THOUGHT.

The childlike faith, the wistful awe
  Which used my breast to thrill
Whene'er the vested priest I saw—
  The love and trust that fill
And ever filled the Irish heart
  For God's anointed priest;
Towards my own self must I in part
  Feel thus—I am a priest!
  O God! Thy last and least.

The third volume, "Altar Flowers," is a republication, with a few changes and additions, of "The Harp of Jesus," which, "after an edition of three thousand copies had been sold," was allowed to remain out of print. That little volume had been highly commended by the *Dublin Review*, *The Weekly Register*, and even by *The Presbyterian Churchman*. "Altar Flowers" is practically a prayer-book in verse. "The metrical form of these prayers," says the author, "may help children—and perhaps, too, some 'children of a larger growth'—to learn a few of them by heart; and they may occur to the memory in moments when ordinary prayers would not be available. The unusualness of the form, also, may be of use in fixing attention on thoughts that are happily very familiar." Of especial interest to the priest are *The Priest's Communion Day*, *The Vesting of the Priest*, and *The Mass Offered for the Four Ends of Sacrifice*.

H. T. HENRY.

FIVE GREAT OXFORD LEADERS: Keble, Newman, Pusey, Liddon, and Church. By the Rev. Aug. B. Donaldson, M.A., Canon Residentiary and Precentor of Truro. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Rivington's. 1900. Pp. xi—390. Price, $1.75.

There were evident signs at the beginning of the present century that the Established Church of England, with its latitudinarianism and comprehensiveness and its total lack of positive creed and doctrine, was slumbering into disorganization and to its doom. Perhaps its present existence, considered equally in its High, Low, and Broad sections, may be claimed as due to that body of sincere and scholarly men who sprang up in the Colleges of Oxford University during the "thirties." They were ten painful years, and strenuous; and the fruits of the labors were yielded at once and are yielding still, both in the return of many to the faith of their fathers in the one Catholic fold, whose visible head is the successor of St. Peter, and in the spiritual restoration of the English Church itself. The Anglican Communion to-day, thanks to the ardor and culture of those Oxford divines, has a larger place of outward dignity and respect than she had in the early days of the present century, and manifests renewed interest in ecclesiastical teaching, discipline, and worship. Mr. Donaldson, in the work above named, has chosen five of the leaders of this revival,—the Oxford or Tractarian Movement,—of whom Keble, Newman, and Pusey were undoubtedly the three central figures on the canvas; and Liddon and Church may be readily conceded places in the forefront.

Of these five Oxford leaders—all, save Liddon, Fellows of Oriel College—John Keble was the senior, and to him is given the credit of inaugurating the Movement by his memorable Assize sermon, preached on July 13, 1833. It was during this year that Newman and Keble started the famous "Tracts for the Times." The ascetic Keble, poet and Bible scholar, retired early from the Oxford arena to the almost cloistered life of the rural vicarage of Hursley, whence he maintained sympathetic if not very active relations with the Tractarians. To John Henry Newman, however, belongs the title *par excellence* of leader of the Oxford revival. "Keble had given the inspiration, Froude had given the impulse, then Newman took up the work, and the impulse henceforth and the direction were his," says Dean Church in his *History of the Oxford Movement* (p. 32). It was Newman's keen, truth-seeking, fearless, and earnest intellect that set men a thinking, and brought to him men of high purpose and honesty, ready and eager to do, in union with him, whatever they could to set in order

the English Church and ward off the impending dangers they were beginning to discern. Around Newman they rallied, and the Movement took shape and was directed by him, whether he would or not, and in spite of him in the end. In 1834, Edward Bouverie Pusey joined the restorers, and "gave us a position and a name," says the great English Cardinal in his *Apologia*. The learned Orientalist, who had been a keen supporter of Catholic Emancipation, contributed eight of the ninety Tracts for the Times, defending the Sacramental system, the Episcopacy, the visible Church, her feasts and fasts, her creed and authority. Events followed quickly at Oxford during the next few years, tending to the disparagement of the Tractarians, out of sympathy, as they were, with the University heads. In 1841 Tract XC appeared and precipitated the storm. The unjust suspicions and coldness that had hitherto been the lot of the Tractarians gave way to violent and unseemly antagonism. About this time Dr. Wiseman, afterwards Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, entered the discussion, and from a different camp Archdeacon Manning, whilst William George Ward and Frederick Oakley led the advanced party still further in their Catholic principles. The patient, moderate Dr. Pusey was distressed at the turn events had taken, but Newman was prepared to accept serenely whatever the future might have in store. The party had been gradually dividing into two camps, and the break was widened by the affair of the Jerusalem Bishopric in 1841, and the degrading from his degree of William George Ward and the condemnation of Frederick Oakley. Newman's conversion in 1845 brought "catastrophe" to the Movement, to use Dean Church's word. In that same year, Dr. Pusey founded an Anglican Sisterhood, and though he was yet under suspicion as being a "Romanizer," he declined the advice of those who counselled him to assume an anti-Roman attitude, until the cry of Papal Aggression, in 1852, shortly after the conversions of Mr. Maskell, Mr. Allies, Mr. Dodsworth, H. W. Wilberforce, and Manning, and R. Wilberforce. Dr. Pusey continued until his death, in 1882, in the Anglican Church, a moderate and industrious supporter of the Catholic interpretation of the Anglican formularies and of the later Ritual party, the direct descendants of the Oxford revival. Henry Parry Liddon, the close friend of Dr. Pusey, and orator of the party, helped to propagate the Catholic principles of the Movement in his "Bampton Lectures," and from the pulpit of St. Paul's, London, where his polished, earnest, and eloquent discourses continued to attract large congregations during the twenty years of his residence as Canon. Of the last of

these great Oxford theologians and preachers, Richard William Church, Dean of St. Paul's, it may be said that the literary beauty of his writings and the charm of his personality did much to find favor for the teachings of the Tractarians.

The author has given us a very readable book, which, if it is not original, is marked with an even critical temper and candor. The part played by each of the five leaders is traced with a sympathetic and skilful hand, and, although the author would distinguish between the Catholic Church—which he "reverently loves to call his spiritual Mother"—and the Roman Catholic, he has not allowed himself to be swerved from the path of justice and truth in his treatment of the great head of the Movement, Cardinal Newman.

LA SAINTE BIBLE POLYGLOTTE, contenant le Texte Hébreu original, le Texte Grec des Septante, le Texte Latin de la Vulgate, et la Traduction Française de M. l'Abbé Glaire; avec les Différences de l'Hébreu, des Septante et de la Vulgate; des Introductions, des Notes, des Cartes et des Illustrations. Par F. Vigouroux, Prêtre de Saint-Sulpice. Précédée d'une Préface de Mgr. Mignot, Évêque de Fréjus. — ANCIEN TESTAMENT. TOME I. LE PENTATEUQUE: INTRODUCTION GÉNÉRALE. L'EXODE.—LE LÉVITIQUE.—LES NOMBRES.—LE DEUTERONOME. (Fascicules II et III.) Paris: A. Roger et Chernoviz; Montréal: Cadieux et Derome. Pp. xxvii—1034. Prix, $1.00 (post free).

The title of this work is so amply descriptive of its contents that nothing more would appear necessary to make the reader acquainted with what it may import him to know in order to estimate its claim to a place in his library. Possibly the same fact seemed to the editor adequate reason for omitting from the first fasciculus, published several years ago, any descriptive introduction. Be this as it may, it is certain that the initial section of the work appeared with the simple summary of the general contents of the Pentateuch, and a short suggestion as to the line of its defense, but with no account of the materials and editorial elements that enter into the making of the present Polyglot. The demands of reviewers for some detailed information on the latter heads may have occasioned the prefixing to the second fasciculus an introduction by the eminent editor, which might well have had a place in the first. From this introduction we learn that the Hebrew column in the Polyglot contains the Masoretic text given

in the ordinary edition of Van der Hooght.[1] The material difficulties connected with Hebrew typography induced the editor to procure the plates used in the Polyglot Bible of Stier and Theile,[2] the characters in this edition being remarkable for neatness, fidelity, and correctness. The student desirous of knowing the minute results of recent critical research on the original text is referred to the Leipzig editions of Baer and Delitzsch and to the work of Ginsburg. The Greek column gives the *textus receptus* (*Codex Vaticanus*), the variations from the Hebrew being noted, as also the principal variations from the other Codices—the Alexandrine, the Sinaitic and the Rescript of St. Ephraim. In the beginning of the volume—the first fasciculus —the variations are reproduced from Stier and Theile. Since the latter Polyglot in its initial portion reproduced substantially the Sixtine edition, the Abbé Vigouroux has utilized the Greek plates as well as those for the Hebrew, of that Polyglot. As the present work advanced, however, the divergences were found to be so many that the editor deemed it necessary to make his own revision of the Roman edition, noting, of course, the special variations. The Latin column contains the Vulgate, and the French translation is that made by the Abbé Glaire, as expressed in the title above.

Brief annotations and illustrations exhibiting the results of modern research in Bible lands make the work available both for linguistic and for exegetical purposes. In it the scriptural student is supplied with a handy, neatly printed and critical recension of the original texts, a serviceable copy of the Latin and French translations, together with a literal and practical commentary. With little expense he may thus possess himself of a small though valuable Biblical library. One could desire that some arrangement had been effected by the editor and publisher whereby the English and German and other modern translations might be substituted for the French, so that the work would meet more closely the requirements of students in other countries. Perhaps it is not yet too late for such an arrangement.

[1] Amsterdam, 1705. Revised by Hahn and Theile.

[2] Bielefeld, Velhagen, and Klasing.

S. ALPHONSE DE LIGUORI, Musicien, et la Reforme du Chant Sacré. Par Père J. Bogaerts, Redemptoriste. Ouvrage honoré d'une lettre de S. Eminence L. M. Parocchi. Paris: P. Lethielleux. Prix, 5 fr.

CHANT DE LA PASSION. Paroles et Musique de S. Alphonse de Liguori. Texte original italien et Texte français. Paris: P. Lethielleux. Prix net: 2 fr. 50.

(The *Chant de la Passion* is bound in with the work first noted.)

We begin our review of this important work at a point where the reviewer usually stops—a description of the material aspects of the volume. Its low price would be apt to convey an altogether wrong impression of the splendid typographical excellence, the numerous and very interesting pictorial and musical illustrations, the elegance of the rubricated borders, and the rich heaviness of the paper. The "Song of the Passion," a cantata for two voices, with obligato accompaniment of piano, violin, and basses, fills 27 pages—quite a respectable length. We note all these merely material features as an indication of the high estimate formed of his task by the publisher as well as by the author. And we hasten to add our own testimony of the appropriateness of that two-fold estimate. Père Bogaerts has placed under obligations to his zeal and ability, not alone the great religious order whose founder he has thus striven to honor, but also the whole Catholic body, lay and clerical. It is pleasant to the cultured Catholic heart to read in St. Alphonsus' musical attainments a further illustration of the saying attributed to Cardinal Wiseman, that St. Charles Borromeo was, "as true saints ever were, a man of real taste." Without seeking minutely for suffrages to such a sentiment, one needs but to recall the epoch-making names in asceticism,—St. Ambrose, St. Gregory the Great, St. Philip Neri, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Alphonsus Liguori.

Père Bogaerts' work deserves rather an article than a short "review" notice—so many interesting things does it contain and suggest. The first chapter considers the Saint's technical abilities in music, and ranks them very high. We should naturally expect as much from the recital of the parental care exercised in this matter. A biographer thus tells the story: "Don Joseph, his father, being passionately fond of music, wished his son also to excel in it. He ordered Alphonsus to pass three hours daily with his music-teacher. So much importance did he attach to this training, that, when unable

to assist personally, as was his custom, at the lesson, *he locked pupil and teacher in their room,* and then sallied forth to attend his business. When only twelve or thirteen years of age, the Saint played on the harpsichord like a master." The time and place were alike happy in developing the precocious ability of the boy. Naples was then a great musical centre in a land which held an incontestable supremacy in music. The whole peninsula was one grand conservatory, teaching the new style which had supplanted that of the polyphonic school. Alphonsus seems to have shared the exacting tastes of his father. "Music," said Alphonsus, "is an art which, if it be not perfectly mastered, not only does not please, but positively displeases." Nor did his later years leave him destitute of a taste for poetry and song. "He so excelled," says his biographer, "both in music and poetry, that after he had become old, he still wrote verses and composed marvelously well. Amongst other songs by him, we possess a little *Duo* between the soul and the suffering Jesus, which he had rendered between the catechism and the sermon, . . . whilst he was giving the spiritual exercises."

The *Duo* spoken of here was found in the year 1860—just a century after the date which the MS. bears—in the British Museum, by the Chevalier Frederick de Liguori, one of the descendants of the Liguori family. Being a thorough musician, he edited the MS. for publication. Père Bogaerts discusses the literary merits of the poetry. We may rest assured of those merits, if we have conned over the many other verses of the Saint. The music of the *Duo* deserves and receives an extended analysis at the hands of P. Bogaerts, to whose volume we refer the reader; or, better still, we beg the musical reader to scrutinize the composition itself—the "Chant de la Passion" noted above. The testimony of cultured musicians will assure him of the real excellence of this cantata. Rev. F. X. Haberl, the eminent expert in Gregorians, and the author of the *Magister Choralis*, praises it; M. Tinel, professor in the Conservatory of Brussels, and a musical composer, declares that the *Duo* is unquestionably written by a talented musician, and that it contains beauties of the highest order; its English publisher declared the *Stabat* of Pergolese inferior to this work of St. Alphonsus.

In the second chapter the author considers the Saint's efforts in the reformation of the popular religious songs in the vernacular. Poetry and song became in his hands not so much a personal recreation as a wide-reaching apostolate. We may not follow the 28 pages devoted to this theme. We desire simply to note the exqui-

site "Gesu mio con dure funi," whose music is given (p. 71) in full. It would serve admirably for an easy and effective substitute for Palestrina's *Improperia*. Neither may we discuss the next chapter on the relations of the Saint to Gregorian chant—"St. Alphonse restaurateur du Chant liturgique"—to which 11 pages are devoted. In the concluding chapter, which covers 50 pages, large attention is given to the principles announced at various times by the Saint in the matter of liturgical reform in music.

He especially desired that the law forbidding figured music in monasteries and convents should be rigorously observed. "The church," said he, "is not a theatre, and religious are not opera-singers." However lenient his disposition was, he would never allow *solos*. Despite his utmost efforts, figured music occasionally held its old position. It happened on a certain evening that a nun was singing the litany in figured music, when suddenly the Saint put in an appearance. With almost as rapid and sudden a *volto subito* the nun substituted Gregorian chant. The Saint said nothing at the time, but awaited his opportunity to say at the grille: "You wished to deceive me; you were singing at first figured music, and then suddenly changed it for Gregorian; 'twas not well done; my prohibition was based on the unsuitableness of figured music for you, as it is a kind of music which appeals to libertines, who come to church, not from devotion, but to hear the sisters sing; and who does not see that this is a source of faults and sins?" On two occasions a young lady was admitted into the convent on the plea urged by the sisters that her musical accomplishments would make her valuable to the community as a teacher of Gregorians. The Saint uttered, on both occasions, a prophecy—afterwards fulfilled—that the young ladies would not persevere. Then the sisters, aroused to the full meaning of their action, admitted that their duplicity was not blessed either by the bishop or by Almighty God. Nevertheless, the Saint was not a rigorist in church-music. He permitted figured music within certain proper limitations, and even singing in the vernacular in church. His main delight was, however, Gregorian chant, which he strove to revive in frequency and excellence of rendition. Père Bogaerts goes at length into the subject of the Saint's influence in the reform-movement which culminated recently in the labors of men like Witt and his collaborators in the St. Cecilia Society founded by him.

We are now ready to understand and appreciate the claim modestly set forth by the author in the *Avant-Propos* of his volume. He thinks that neither St. Cecilia nor St. Gregory can properly assume

the position of patron of church-music, but that St. Alphonsus unites in his own person all the requirements for that splendid patronage. He hopes to see this last glory formally assigned to the Saint by the proper authority, and that as a result the Catholic world may find in the cultured and sainted founder not alone a Doctor of eminent authority in dogma, morals, asceticism; a Saint of winning personality; a bishop of unflagging zeal; but as well a Patron of universal church-music. Eight pages are devoted to this introductory plea, and to the arguments there set forth we commend the reader.

H. T. HENRY.

THE GODS OF OLD; and the Story That They Tell. By the Rev. James A. Fitz Simon and Vincent A. Fitz Simon, M.D. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1899. Pp. xxiv—456.

The primary object of this work is to show "that the names of the gods and goddesses are but the nomenclature of science; that the myths are, as it were, extended definitions of the names; and that the names and myths combined, of the older deities, form a connected narrative of the Creation, and a valuable stepping-stone between the highly condensed scriptural story and the prolix one of philosophy, astronomy, geology, etc." To establish this general position the authors draw out a parallelism between the personages or abstractions figuring in Greek mythology and the physical processes of nature of which modern scientific hypotheses and theories offer explanations. Thus, for instance, Chaos and the mythical characters thence emerging—Erebus and Nox, with their immediate offspring, Æther and Hemera—are described as the personified representations of the original conditions and incipient stages of cosmical development. Gæa, the mythical daughter of Chaos, and her progeny by Uranus, that is, the Titans, Cyclopes, and Hecatoncheires, stand for the processes and play of forces in the subsequent development of the *universe*; whilst the mythical offspring of Gæa by Pontus represent the physical processes involved in the genesis of our *planet*, in its earlier geological stages. The further geological development of the earth, and the advent thereto of living forms, plant and animal and even of man, are shown to have their analogues in other personages of Greek mythology. The materials from which this parallelism between the ancient myths and modern hypothetical explanation of nature's processes is deduced, are the pagan classics, especially Hesiod and Ovid. Possibly some critical readers may think the analogies at times

over-strained, and the ancients credited with a broader and subtler knowledge of nature than they actually possessed. The arguments, moreover, based on Greek etymology, will not always bear the rigorous scrutiny of modern philology. Aside from these aspects, the book manifests considerable originality and ingenuity, is highly interesting, and attractively made up and clothed.

PSYCHOLOGIA RATIONALIS sive Philosophia de Anima Humana, in usum scholarum. (*Pars IV. Cursus Philosophicus.*) **Auctore Bernardo Boedder, S.J. Editio altera, aucta et emendata. Friburgi Brisgoviae: Sumptibus Herder (St. Louis, Mo.). 1899. Pp. xvii—422. Pretium, $1.50.**

A number of important changes and additions have been made in the present reissue of this well-known manual of Psychology. The changes consist in a clearer statement and development of much of the matter concerning the sense-operations. The author has also revoked the opinion he previously held as to the merely virtual distinction between the *species intelligibilis impressa* and the *expressa*. The probability of a *real* distinction is maintained in the new edition. *Sapientis est mutare consilium.*

The additional matter inserted in the text relates to subjects hitherto scarcely noticed in the Latin manual, such, namely, as regard psychological and psycho-physical theories on quality, stimuli, intensity of sensation (n. 53 ff.), sense-illusions (n. 128 ff.), the feelings (n. 435 ff.), the temperaments (n. 546 ff.), and abnormal psychosis (n. 570 ff.). An examination of these additions reveals the fact that they are precisely on the lines on which the psychology of the schools needs supplementing in order to bring it into closer contact with the empirical and physiological psychology in which the present generation is so intensely interested. The discussion of these timely topics will enable the student in our ecclesiastical seminaries the better to correlate the neo-scholastic philosophy with the "new psychology" and to appreciate the strength of his own position, as well as to estimate the value of the results of the immense experimental activity of our times; all of which results, when certain, are found to fit into and to fill out the system of Catholic psychology. In this feature, Father Boedder's work stands alone, we believe, amongst the Latin manuals on the subject.

Recent Popular Books.[1]

ANGLO-SAXONS AND OTHERS: Aline Gorren. $1.50.

This author is a critic, not a panegyrist or a satirist, and she discerns faults in nearly all races, religions and institutions, but she writes with gravity and without eccentricity, and her criticisms, favorable and unfavorable, are keen and clever. The quality of her book makes its attraction to young readers very small, but such should be warned of her sceptical bias; those whose faith is beyond danger from an occasional slighting comment will find entertainment in her analysis of racial traits.

AS TALKED IN THE SANCTUM: Rounsevelle Wildman. $1.00.

These discussions, printed in the *Overland Monthly* during the author's editorship, are carried on by the magazine staff, the Parson and the Office Boy, and, as the talkers really reflect actual persons, the book is unlike others with a similar scheme, and merits attention, especially in the East, which is generally unconscious of the excellent literary product of the Pacific Coast. Mr. Wildman's present position as Consul-General at Hong-Kong will bring him new readers, but these "Talks" represent California.

AT START AND FINISH: William Lindsey. $1.25.

The supposed narrator of these stories is an English trainer of American college athletes, and the tales conform strictly to the conditions under which intercollegiate contests are managed. They are pleasant reading for those entirely indifferent to the student's welfare; but any parent or professor who accepts them as true and does not oppose such contests with all his power must possess a triple-armored conscience.

BRITISH ARMY: A Lieutenant-Colonel in the Army. Introduction by Major-General J. F. Maurice. $5.00 (net).

This khaki-bound volume, with its minute descriptions and exact pictures of field and parade uniform and equipment, gives the knowledge necessary to recognize the grade and arm of the service of any officer or private, except those following the latest South African fashion. It also describes the daily routine in cantonments and camp and on the march, describes the formation of route trains, and gives all details useful to quartermasters. It is intended for officers' use, but it might serve to rouse enthusiasm in school military cadets. Portraits of British and Irish generals and of Lord Lansdowne are among the pictures.

CAMBRIC MASK: R. W. Chambers. $1.25.

Railway speculation, butterfly breeding, "Whitecap" outrages, four love affairs, and no small humor are mingled in this amusing story, ending in the horrible death of all the villains, and of the useless man, whose weakness is the mainspring of the plot. The butterfly passages are written with enthusiasm, and each individual speculator has sufficient unscrupulousness to furnish a "trust."

CHARLES SUMNER: Moorfield Storey. $1.25.

This biography is written in a spirit as uncompromising as that which animated its subject, but with almost judicial fairness. As Sumner's private secretary, the author knew the man well, and for years has studied the politician and his times, and the result is a book which is a history of the Republican party, down to the spring of 1874, and of the earlier Free Soil party in Massachusetts. It is admirably written, with dignity at the present moment rare even in the treatment of the most serious subjects, and with much skill in showing the disposition of party forces, and the interaction of contending interests.

CRIMINAL: His Personnel and Environment: August Drahms. $2.00.

The author, a State Prison Chaplain, is highly recommended by Sig. Lombroso as one who understands his theory, but the American author is no blind follower of the Italian, and his statistics give his work independent value. It is unsuitable food for susceptible or unformed minds, but mature persons having charge of youth, or any relations with the criminal classes, will find it useful. Instinctive and habitual criminals, juvenile and single offenders, the relation of hypnotism and crime, punishment, reformation, and prevention are considered, and a carefully prepared index and bibliography are appended.

DANVIS PIONEER: Rowland E. Robinson. $1.25.

The hero is one of the early settlers in Vermont, and part of their struggle with the forest, the wild beasts, the red man, and the Briton, and of the long, hard con-

[1] The prices given are those for which the books will be sent by the publisher postpaid. The best booksellers in large cities grant a discount of twenty-five per cent. except on choice books, but the buyer pays express charges.

All the books herein mentioned may be ordered from Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York; Henry T. Coates & Co.: Philadelphia; W. B. Clarke Co.: Boston; Robert Clark: Cincinnati; Burrows Bros. Co.: Cleveland; Messrs. A. C. McClurg & Co.: Chicago.

test which transformed the wilderness into prosperous farming country The author's mind is saturated with the history and legends of his native State, and with those racy neighborhood traditions, so delightful when genuine, so atrociously stupid when spurious. The dialect has philological value, being an accurate reproduction of the tongue spoken by the uneducated Vermonter even after the railways penetrated the country.

EXPERIENCE OF DOROTHY LEIGH: Frances Home. $1.25.

The experience is gathered in a nurses' training-school attached to a large hospital. Dorothy herself is pretty and pert, but kind-hearted, and produces unforeseen complications in the medical and surgical service. Her love-story is of the common species, which begins with a quarrel; the peculiarity of the novel is its revelations of a nurse's life when studying her business, and may well discourage those inclined to adopt it without genuine vocation, although others may see something attractive in the evident opportunities for flirtation.

FIRST AMERICAN; His Homes and His Households: Leila Herbert. $2.00.

The early and recent death of the author forbids any criticism of the style and method of this work, more severe than the statement that they betray inexperience in every phrase and paragraph. The substance of the book is collected from many biographies and memoirs, and includes very little that is novel, although its arrangement in this shape brings Washington down to the apprehension of persons who read newspaper descriptions of bridal outfits and actresses' wardrobes, persons in whose society he would not have delighted. A portrait of the beautiful young author, and other pictures, some good and some remarkably bad, illustrate the volume.

FOLLY CORNER: H. Dudeney. $1.25.

The sorry heroine, her lover being in prison, answers a newspaper advertisement for a wife and finds that the advertiser, the head of an old farming family, is a remote cousin, much disposed to fall in love with her, and willing to shelter her in her poverty. Unluckily, the lover is released and the heroine, infatuated, runs away to him on the very eve of her marriage with the farmer. Too late she discovers that her marriage with the released prisoner is invalidated by the existence of a former wife, and she returns to her kinsman, whom she at last learns to love. Her character, ignoble as it is, is complex and interesting, but the hero's rustic plain speaking should hardly be set before young readers, although it is an excellent foil for the heroine's sham modesty.

FORTUNE OF WAR: Elizabeth N. Barrow. $1.25.

The heroine, the daughter of a general in the British army occupying New York during the Revolutionary War, has many lovers, of whom two, a British officer and a young American, are chief. She is a headstrong and adventurous young person, and her story, although somewhat prolix, is above the average Revolutionary romance, thanks to her way of viewing such trifles as war, sieges, and battles as incidents in her personal history. Mrs. Washington and Hamilton are among the foes of whom she makes friends, and the description of the besieged city is striking and original.

HEARTS IMPORTUNATE: Evelyn Dickinson. $1.25.

The hero, an Englishman living in Australia, falls in love with a beautiful Englishwoman, concerning whom a wandering tramp circulates a disgraceful story, received with much pleasure by female scandal-mongers. The hero, not regarding himself as saintly, refuses to consider any of the heroine's past misdeeds, and the author seems to prophesy happiness for the two, whom the closing paragraph leaves betrothed. The slanderous women are described with some pungency, but the story needs condensation.

HEREDITY AND HUMAN PROGRESS: W. Duncan McKim. $1.50.

This is, upon the whole, a hopeful book, but its coldly scientific teaching and the entire absence of reference to any principle higher than expedience make it dangerous reading for imperfectly instructed youth and unpleasant to any Christian, even although well read in science. Its author, however, does not profess to address the ignorant, or to adapt himself to the religious, but devotes himself to the forcible presentation of his subject.

HOUSE OF A HUNDRED LIGHTS: Frederic Ridgely Torrence. $1.00.

A very little volume printed in a limited edition and containing a hundred couplets, called by their author "A Psalm of Experience." Severe common sense, paradoxically expressed, and a few cynical epigrams are the matter of the volume, but faith is not among the "lights," and the "psalm," although clever, is imperfect. As it is plainly intended to represent the Oriental mind, this is no defect, but some of the weaker brethren always mistake such work for a new revelation. *E. g.*, "The Light of Asia."

IROKA: Tales of Japan: Adakichi Kinnosuke. $1.25.

These are simple stories, interesting chiefly because written in English by a native of Japan, but otherwise of slight value and not novel.

JOAN OF THE SWORD HAND: S. R. Crockett. $1.50.

The heroine, the Duchess of an imagined realm, goes in male attire to see to what manner of bridegroom she is betrothed, and falls in love with his cousin whom she mistakes for him. She fulfils her pledge for her duchy's sake, but the author kills off the bridegroom after a reasonable num-

ber of pages, and Duchess Joan weds to suit herself. The author's irresistible tendency to exaggeration spoils what might have been a good story of its species, and debases its comedy to farce.

JOHN RUSKIN: M. H. Spielmann. $2.00.

This work is not hastily written, although published so soon after Mr. Ruskin's death, and it is a valuable account of the man and his influence. Many unpublished letters and many citations from books are included in the volume, which is adequately illustrated. The personal story is told with good taste, without rendering judgment upon it.

LE MORTE DARTHUR: Sir Thomas Malory. 2 vols. $3.00.

This edition, printed in large, beautiful type on good paper, gives Malory's complete story with a good biographical introduction, but with no parade of notes, being intended for scholars, not for schools.

LETTERS TO MME. HANSKA: Honore de Balzac. Translated and edited by Katharine Prescott Wormeley.

The editor has chosen to make this volume unsuitable for indiscriminate recommendation by giving space to letters partly and entirely forged, unworthy of Balzac, and incompatible with his principles, as indicated in his writings and conduct. The genuine letters and the real story of his acquaintance with Mme. Hanska have great interest and are unique in literature.

LIFE OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN: Ida M. Tarbell. 2 vols. $3.50.

The first volume of this book is mainly composed of unimportant details of Lincoln's childhood, youth, and early manhood; about half of the second is given to his Presidential terms and to the war, the chief aim of the maker being to include something neglected by former writers, and to explain the pictures and portraits. Miss Tarbell performs this species of work very well, but the result is not history, and should not be so esteemed.

MAKER OF NATIONS: Guy Boothby. $1.00.

The villain, whose days are passed in making South American revolutions for a commission on the subscriptions, purchases, and gross profits, has already been described by Mr. Harding Davis, and Mr. Boothby tells nothing new about him, but makes one of his regular performances the background for a love-story in which the hero is transformed from a gambling adventurer into a high-minded gentleman.

MEMOIR OF H. R. H. PRINCESS MARY ADELAIDE, DUCHESS OF TECK: C. Kinloch Cooke. 2 vols. $7.50.

A simple story of a good woman's life in courts and among royal personages. As mother of a probable future queen, consort and grandmother of a probable future king of England, as cousin of Queen Victoria, her character is an interesting study, and it finds full expression in the diaries and letters upon which these volumes are based. A large number of portraits in photogravure and of other pictures from the collections of the Duchess of York, and the late Duchess of Gloucester, aunt of the Duchess, accompany the text. Comparison of this chronicle with Miss Burney, much more with the memoirs of the regency and reign of George IV and the reign of William IV, might soothe the gentlemen who deem that morality and Christianity are suffering because they are not omnipotent.

MEMORIES: C. Kegan Paul.

This record of the conditions of English middle-class life is almost incredible in its revelations as to sanitation and the hardships endured by schoolboys and students in a land supposed to worship comfort and cheerfulness, and strikingly illustrates the depth separating the daily life of former and present times. It also abounds in good stories of clever and of eccentric persons, and it shows the path by which the writer was guided into the Church, and touchingly describes the peace and joy found therein.

MEN WITH THE BARK ON: Frederic Remington. $1.25.

Good pictures and stories, of a literary quality to be logically inferred from the title, fill this volume. The subjects are those with which the author is well acquainted—frontiersmen and soldiers—but his style is little more elegant than theirs, and he has no sense of proportion in narration.

MINX: Kathleen Mannington Caffyn (Iota). $1.50.

The hero's father and stepmother, perceiving the extreme desirability of their son, and the family need of money, are fully persuaded that he will be captured by a "minx," but the young woman whose charms conquer him is nothing worse than a girl burdened with some unassimilated learning, many impracticable theories, and a conviction that the general reformation of the universe is one of her minor duties. The story would be amusing had the author been able to lay aside her trick of frequent reference to matters not ordinarily discussed outside of scientific circles and the club-rooms of women. As it stands, its tendency is to make the young reader knowing, but unwise.

MIRRY-ANN: Norma Lorimer. $1.00.

A Manx romance, pitilessly exposing a state of dire immorality, but with a blameless heroine, whose three lovers have good reason for their love. Misdirected gratitude impels her to betroth herself to a fisherman, blinded in saving her grandfather's life; but he, being fiercely jealous, murders another man who loves her, and then succumbs to his family curse of lunacy, and dies; leaving her free to marry him whom

she really prefers. The young woman preaches Methodism, but in no other way resembles Dinah Morris.

MR. TRUNNELL, MATE OF THE SHIP PIRATE: T. Jenkins Hains. $1.25.

The hero, by virtue of always obeying captains' orders, manages to survive fights, mutinies, piratic attacks, shipwreck, ship-burning, and a few other trifles, and to smile upon the loves of the narrator and the daughter of one of the captains, their joint experience having included escape from poisoning. A detective, a murderer, and a burglar add to the complications of the tale, in which the nautical dialect is chiefly compounded of sanguinary and horticultural adjectives. The separate incidents are said to be authentic; their collection in one story is absurd. Few adult readers will care to peruse the whole book; no child should be allowed to attempt the task.

NOTES ON SPORT AND TRAVEL: George Henry Kingsley. $3.50.

The writer had two antipathies, which his daughter and biographer, Miss Mary Kingsley, honestly mentions; they were Catholic priests and Mr. Gladstone, and in his travel notes traces of the feeling appear here and there, to their disadvantage. Otherwise, they are written with such cleverness and humor, and show such overflowing vitality and good spirits, that they are both amusing and refreshing. His daughter's reminiscences indicate that her uncles did not have to go beyond their family circle to find the original of some of their most amazing personages.

OUTSIDE THE RADIUS: W. Pett Ridge. $1.25.

The scene of these fifteen stories is a "Crescent" in semi-rural London, and the characters are its inhabitants, men and women of the middle class, fortultously assembled in one place, and living their lives quite independently. The quiet humor and good feeling of the book make its simple annals very unlike any of its author's earlier works, in which he studied petty criminals and unhappy poverty, and his general description of the place is worthy of Mrs. Gaskell.

POOR PEOPLE: I. K. Friedman. $1.50.

The scene of this novel is the Chicago tenement-house; the hero, a devoted son, whose years are seemingly wasted in striving to guide his clever but erratic father in the path of decent behavior, although, really, his spiritual and mental stature is increased and his work perfected by his self-sacrifice. The characters, good and bad, are typical. The Christian element is absent from the story, the author being of the elder faith.

PRACTICAL AGITATION: John Jay Chapman. $1.25.

This small volume is an earnest and courageous appeal to the reader to do his best to elevate national morality by entering energetically upon some good work, making no compromise with any existing evil practice or principle, but going straight to the end desired, entirely dissevering himself from the things called party, the machine, and politics; and when he has gathered a following, directing its power against their abuses. Mr. Riis's "Ten Years' War" illustrates this book extremely well, and awful examples demonstrating its truthfulness may be found in any American city with sufficient capital to be worth a dishonest man's attention. The author's style is sometimes too concise for popular apprehension, and in one or two cases lends itself to the purpose of any politician disposed to divert a phrase from its true meaning, but a proud indifference to dishonest commentators is an engaging if impolitic trait of behavior.

PRELUDE AND THE PLAY: Rufus Mann. $1.50.

This novel, apparently the product of an unpractised hand, and a mind uninstructed in evil, has a heroine whose high-minded purity is in beautiful contrast to the morbid knowledge of the advanced woman, and atones for many artistic faults of construction and style. The three men who love her learn as much from mere temptation as most heroes learn from sin and repentance; but the suicide of one is so timidly described that it seems almost an act of virtue. Imperfect as it is, the story affords more wholesome reading than many pieces of better fiction, and promises something really fine for the future.

RECOLLECTIONS—1832-1886: Sir Algernon West. $3.00.

The author, as director in a bank and in various companies, and as secretary to Mr. Gladstone and other officials, has accumulated a store of reminiscences and good stories, and repeats them in a manner generally good-humored, although sometimes so keenly appreciative of superficial defects of manner as to seem slightly malicious. Few persons of any consequence are omitted from the list of subjects.

RESURRECTION: Count Tolstoy. $1.50.

The author's entirely private judgment of everything, from the New Testament down to a lawyer's manners, and his cynical fashion of stating it, would make a pleasant story hideous; but he has chosen an utterly vicious heroine and an unworthy hero, has minutely described all their sins, and also Russian court procedure and treatment of the worst class of criminals, and has made a book unfit for women to read and unpleasant for any man, except possibly an observer of mental disease. The "resurrection" is the asserted return of the hero and heroine to goodness, that is to say, his wish to defy common sense and social morality, and her determination to marry another man. The author's taste for coarseness seems to increase with advancing age, and the Russian censor had good reason for abridging his story.

ROMANTIC TRIUMPH: T. S. Omond. $1.50 (net).

This, the eleventh volume of the "Periods of European Literature" series, describes and criticises the chief authors, and mentions and defines all of any note, and gives an account of the romantic movement and its causes. Half of the book is devoted to Great Britain and Ireland. France and Germany have a chapter apiece, and another suffices for the remaining European lands. The author finds that "humanity," meaning thereby making man the central interest, was the chief characteristic of romantic literature. Both theology and science are as far as possible denied any consideration, and when mentioned are treated in a colorless manner. The volume is adapted for use in schools, although intended rather for the general reader, and its dates make it a good manual of reference.

ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON: L. Cope Cornford. $1.50.

An enthusiastic biography, with much loving criticism and many long extracts from the best work of the late novelist, make a volume excellently adapted to introduce a young reader to his writings. It is also fitted to awaken a student's mind to the charm of fitly chosen word and delicately modulated phrase, and to make him aware of the difference between Stevenson and that woeful thing, mock-Stevenson.

SHE WALKS IN BEAUTY: Katharine Tynan. $1.50.

The familiar tale of the Irish heroine with marvelous beauty, a tattered frock, an unspeakably shabby home, and comfortable indifference to all three, is pleasantly retold in this book, which ends in a peerage for the heroine's father, a baronet for the heroine, a peer to accept her sister's offer of marriage, and measureless content for all. It is little more than a fairy-tale in nineteenth century costume, but it is pretty, and is not, like most of the stories which it resembles, related in the present tense.

SOVEREIGN LADIES OF EUROPE: Countess A. von Bothmar. $3.00.

Sketches of all the reigning princesses of Europe are included in this book, and a life of the late Empress of Austria is added. Portraits of the empresses and queens, of their husbands, and in some cases their children, illustrate the text, which is descriptive of tastes and daily habits, and gives biographical outlines. Having been originally published in an English paper, the book takes the middle path between the scandalous insinuations, agreeable to the anarchists, and the fulsome praise of the courtier, but the furious republican may find it too respectful.

TONE KING: H. Rau. $1.50.

The early chapters, relating with but slight additions the ready-made fairy-tale of Mozart's childhood, are charming, although prolix. The embellishment of the later passages is not a grace, but is fairly well managed, and the book is superior to the ordinary "musical novel."

WHITE DOVE: W. J. Locke. $1.50.

A wonderful specimen of the genus hypocrite more or less blights the life of every man and woman in this story, but completely collapses in the end. His chief victim is a sinner by whose fault he profits and upon whom he preys during his long years of repentance; the others are the victim's son and his own, and the heroine, the beloved of both. The plot involves so many infractions of the Sixth Commandment as to make the book unwholesome reading, although its moral is clear and its lesson is the unfailing punishment of the evil-doer.

WRECK OF THE CONNEMAUGH: Jenkins Hains. $1.25.

The supposed writer, a consumptive baronet, describes a voyage undertaken to lengthen his days, but ending in virtual suicide, committed to allow a friend to marry the girl whom he loves, although she has a fancy for the hero. This friend vibrates between the peerage and the commonalty in an extraordinary fashion, sometimes being Lord John and Lord Esterbrook on the same page, and certain Cuban filibusters who adorn the tale are rather less real than wax figures.

YEOMAN FLEETWOOD: Mrs. Francis Blundell (M. E. Francis). $1.50.

The heroine's headstrong pride leads her, in the closing chapters, to behave so disgracefully that one parts from her with an unpleasant impression; but the sturdy hero, his father and the Squire and his wife are in every way excellent. The heroine's naughtiness gives the reader a glimpse of the Regent George conducting himself after his manner, and of Mrs. Fitzherbert, to whose good offices the heroine owes much. The author's ability to write an historical novel is demonstrated by this book.